



GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
DEPARTMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY
CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY

CLASS _____

CALL No. **059.0954J.EI.A**

D.G.A. 79.





JOURNAL

OF THE

EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION,

LONDON,

27024

FOUNDED 1866.

VOL. XIV.

059.0954

J. E. I. A.

LONDON:

EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION,

26, CHARING CROSS, S.W.

1882.

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY, NEW DELHI.

Acc. No. 27024

Date. 20.6.57

Call No. 059.0954

J.E.I.A.

LONDON:

PRINTED BY W. J. JOHNSON,

121, FLEET STREET.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XIV.—YEAR 1882.

NO.	PAGE
171.—1881. Dec. 21. ALEXANDER ROGERS.—Land Tenures in Bombay	1
172.—1882. Jan. 18. EDWARD J. WATHERSTON.—Indian and other Foreign Productions in Silver, and why they are virtually Prohibited from Importation into the United Kingdom	26
173.—1882. March 13. SIR RICHARD TEMPLE, Bart., G.C.S.I., D.C.L.—Inaugural Address on assuming the Presidency of the Association	57
174.—1882. March 23. JOHN DACOSTA.—By Whom is India Governed?... CORRESPONDENCE with the Secretary of State for India, by DADABHAI NAOROJI, Esq., on the Condition of India... ..	77 119
175.—1882. May 31. ANNUAL MEETING REPORT, 1879—81	195 204
176.—1882. May 31. W. PIRIE DUFF, F.R.G.S.—Indian Trade and Finance: Past, Present, and Prospective ...	231
177.—1882. June 26. E. J. KHORY.—An Englishman in India List of Life Members LETTER to the Marquis of Hartington relative to the Abkari Act	257 296 300
178.—1882, Nov. 28. H. M. HYNDMAN.—Why should India Pay for the Conquest of Egypt? List of Members of the Bombay Branch of the East India Association LETTER and Resolution of Thanks from the Managing Committee of the Bombay Branch to the Marquis of Ripon, K.G., P.C., G.C.B., <i>re</i> Abkari Act, &c. ADDRESS to the Education Commission of 1882 by the Managing Committee of the Bombay Branch of the East India Association	303 338 341 344





JOURNAL
OF THE
EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION.

Instituted for the independent and disinterested advocacy and promotion, by all legitimate means, of the public interests and welfare of the Inhabitants of India generally.

Land Tenures in Bombay.

PAPER BY ALEXANDER ROGERS, Esq.

READ AT A MEETING HELD IN DOUGHTY HALL, 14, BEDFORD ROW, ON WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON, DECEMBER 21st, 1881.

G. NOBLE TAYLOR, Esq., IN THE CHAIR.

A MEETING of the members of the East India Association and others interested in the affairs of India, was held in Doughty Hall in the rear of the Association's new Chambers, 14, Bedford Row, W.C., on Wednesday afternoon, December 21st, 1881; the subject for consideration being an address delivered by Alexander Rogers Esq., on "Land Tenures in Bombay."

G. NOBLE TAYLOR, Esq., occupied the chair, and amongst those present were the following: Sir Henry Ricketts, K.C.S.I.; Sir William R. Robinson, K.C.S.I.; Sir George Yule, C.B., K.C.S.I.; Major-General G. Burn; Colonel A. B. Rathborne; Rev. J. Long; Surgeon-General Balfour; Dr. Montague D. Makuna; Mr. A. Arathoon; Mr. C. W. Arathoon; Mr. C. N. Banerjee; Mr. H. B. Boswell; Mr. J. R. Boyd; Mr. J. Da Costa; Mr. John Kelsall (M.C.S.); Mr. A. Malet; Mr. O. W. Malet; Mr. P. Pirie Gordon; Mr. W. McGuffin; Mr. Syed Muhammed Meer; Mr. J. F. Moir; Mr. O. C. Mullick; Mr. F. G. Millington; Mr. E. A. Poole; Mr. John Shaw (Madras); Mr. E. Spence; Mrs. Spence; Mr. A. Stewart; Mr. C. Stewart; Mr. Oswin Weynton; Mr. W. Martin Wood; Mr. W. Hamilton Burn, Acting Secretary, &c.

The CHAIRMAN, in introducing Mr. Rogers, said: Ladies and Gentlemen,—The paper which will be read to us this afternoon by my friend Mr. Rogers deals with a subject of the highest importance to those who administer the government of the country, and of vital moment to the millions who are affected by the operations which it describes. The question of an equitable settlement of the land tenures throughout our vast Indian possessions has occupied the attention and taxed the energies of our ablest administrators from the earliest period of British rule, and the views and opinions of the most thoughtful official minds have been recorded at great length upon every conceivable point connected with the subject. The Permanent Settlement of Bengal, the work of Lord Cornwallis and his fellow-labourers, and the Ryotwari Settlement of Madras, which we owe to Sir Thomas Munro, were our two earliest measures in this direction. Whatever their relative merits or defects, they conferred lasting benefit upon the country into which they were introduced, and they gave to landowners of every grade a security of tenure and a moderation of assessment to which they were strangers under former Native rule. Following those two great measures came the survey and settlement of our newly-acquired provinces to the north-west of Bengal, which was proposed in an admirable minute or despatch addressed to the Court of Directors by the Marquis of Hastings when Governor-General in 1815. His plan was reviewed at great length by his able Revenue Secretary, Holt Mackenzie, in a memorandum which has been truly characterized as powerful and exhaustive. Upon that memorandum was based Regulation VII., of 1822, of the Bengal Code, which governed all settlement proceedings in the north of India until they were superseded or modified by subsequent enactments. Later on came the admirable *Khasra* survey and *Pattadari*, or joint village settlement, of the North-western Provinces, with which are associated the honoured names of Robert Mertins Bird and Thomason. The next in order of time was the Revenue Survey and Settlement of Bombay, of which we shall hear more anon, followed after a short interval by similar proceedings in Madras. It is not my purpose to compare the merits of the different systems pursued in various parts of the country; it will be enough to say that the Survey Settlement of Bombay is conspicuous for the care and ability which was bestowed upon every part of the undertaking, and for the eminent success which attended its operations, both in respect to the treatment of the variety of complicated tenures with which it had to deal, and the extreme moderation of the Government demand. From his long experience of Revenue administration, and the opportunities he

has enjoyed of observing the results of the Survey Settlement in the various high positions he has occupied, Mr. Rogers is entitled to speak with authority on the subject, and I feel sure we shall derive both pleasure and profit from what he has to say. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. ROGERS then read the following paper :—

In the paper which I propose to read to you, an endeavour has been made to free the subject, as far as practicable, from technicalities, and, by avoiding the use of vernacular names and terms, to render what has to be said on land tenures in the Bombay Presidency intelligible to an English audience. If there are present among that audience also Anglo-Indians from other parts of India, I shall be glad of the opportunity to disabuse their minds of a good deal of misapprehension, which I know exists in some instances, with regard to the manner in which land tenures have been dealt with in Bombay. A very general impression appears to prevail among the latter class that tenures in which middlemen of various degrees of proprietary or quasi-proprietary right held an intermediate position between the State and the actual tiller of the soil have been ruthlessly extinguished, and all the agricultural population reduced to the one dead level of tenants holding directly from the State. This, I can abundantly show, has not been the case; but, on the contrary, with one single exception, the unwisdom of which has been clearly proved, and from the position taken up in which the Government has had to withdraw itself, existing tenures have been not only upheld, but fortified and improved. Only where the holding of land directly from the State has been customary has the ryotwaree system of the Bombay Revenue Survey and Settlement been introduced in its entirety. It must be remembered that the British power in the Western Presidency succeeded for the most part Mussulman or Mahratta rule of recent and unstable character, under which, if institutions hoary with age existed, they had been invaded or uprooted under the political exigencies of the times, in which the obtaining of revenue for the maintenance of armed forces and the support of needy Courts was the main object of government. Thus it came to pass that he who could produce the largest annual revenue for the time being was in general the most in favour, and the fiscal management of the country got into the hands of those who, if they were not Court parasites who obtained it by favour, could bid highest for it. These in their turn, knowing the instability of their own position, from which a higher bid or a larger official bribe rendered them at

any moment liable to be ousted, made hay whilst the sun shone, making short work of any hereditary claims that stood in the way of their procuring the one thing needful, money, and that speedily. Even in villages in which, under such adverse circumstances, coparcenary communities were found, at the commencement of British rule, to have maintained a desperate existence, the traces of the extortionate demands to which the rent-payers had been subjected remained clearly visible in the large quantities of land held as *vechânia* and *gerânia*—that is, sold or mortgaged—which the head-men responsible for payment of the revenue had from time to time been obliged to part with, or, as the Bombay phrase has it, to alienate, in order to provide the necessary funds. Such was especially the case in the comparatively settled parts of the country, within easy reach of the head-quarters of the Sir-Soubahs or Soubahs of the Mahrattas, to which an expeditionary force could readily be dispatched to bring the refractory to order. In more distant localities, however, or where local Chiefs had armed forces of their own, capable of offering a certain amount of resistance, as in the peninsula of Kattywar, recourse was had to annual or periodical invasions by regular armies, whose irregular proceedings consisted of collecting what they could by force, fraud, or persuasion, and returning home with their plunder until the next year, or the next time that money was wanted. The nature of these expeditions was sufficiently indicated by their name; they were called “Mooluk-geerac,” or country-seizing. After they had retired, however, the inhabitants were for the time being left to their own devices, and managed their local concerns in their own way; and hence arose the great distinction between the tenures on the east and west of the Gulf of Cambay, lying between Goozerat proper and Kattywar, which will shortly be explained.

Before proceeding, however, to describe the different tenures on which villages and estates were held, it will be as well to glance very briefly at the case of smaller portions of land held by individuals or institutions. Such was *Devusthan* and *Dhurmada*, or land held by religious and charitable institutions, or by persons for their own support, for the maintenance of travellers, to provide water for human beings and cattle, &c. Rent-free or lightly assessed land, again, was held for the performance of services of various descriptions for the community or strangers, by the potter, the carpenter, the tailor, the currier, the blacksmith, the sweeper, the priest, the village watchman, and others. Other land was held under the ominous designation of *Buthâmunia*; or usurped; whilst the absence of any organized system of civil administration was betrayed by the existence of cash allowances, or fields held

by Rajpoots or Grassias. This was, avowedly, as blackmail to protect villagers from being plundered by others so long as they themselves were paid. Wānta, or divided land, dated from before the time of the Mahrattas, and was held mostly by Rajpoots as their portion of villages previously under their own control, such portion being reserved to them when the Mussulmans, to some extent, introduced their own direct fiscal administration—probably in the days of Akbar. Of these various descriptions of land some were entirely rent-free, while others paid quit-rents, sometimes permanent in cash or kind, and at others varying according to the village, the caste of the cultivator or holder, the description of crop raised, and numberless other considerations. It is almost needless to say that the majority of the titles on which these lands were held would not have borne a strict legal investigation. Their area was generally small, whilst the expense of making such an investigation would have been immense, and the discontent engendered by interfering with the means of livelihood of thousands of families would have been very great. It was, therefore, considered advisable to compromise matters by the promise of new legal titles to all who would come forward and agree to pay a certain percentage of the assessment. The offer was, for the most part, gladly accepted, and, the old titles being swept away, almost all those lands are now held under the single designation of "Sunundia," or deed-secured land. This was the procedure in the province of Goozerat. The ill feeling produced by the opposite course of strict investigation in the Deccan by the Inam Commission has hardly been repaid by the money brought into the treasury, in consequence of the resumptions of land carried out by it.

It may be stated, broadly, that the system under which individual tenants held directly from the State was found in existence at the introduction of British rule throughout the Presidency, and that the only exceptions to this general rule were in the southern part of the Conkan, which is the sea-coast district below the Western Ghauts and south of Bombay, and in the Collectorates of Broach, Kaira, and Ahmedabad, in the province of Goozerat. In the Southern Conkan there was the Khotee tenure, in Broach the Bhagdaree, in Kaira the Nerwadaree, and in Ahmedabad the Talookdaree, which included the Kusbatee; in all of these there were, and are, middlemen, of differing degrees of proprietary right, between the State and the actual cultivator of the soil.

The Khotas, from whom the Khotee tenure derives its name, were hereditary farmers or proprietors of their estates, which sometimes consisted of more than one village. Some of them held under formal

title-deeds, but the majority by prescription. It would be a waste of time to inquire into the origin of the tenure, and it will be sufficient to say that these farmers or proprietors, as co-parceners, paid to the State rentals in the lump on their estates, varying from year to year according to the market value of the staple produce, which was chiefly rice. Their sub-tenants were of various kinds, some holding on condition of payment of a fixed rent in kind, regulated by the custom of the village; others liable to pay half as much again—that is, 50 per cent. beyond the customary grain rent; others, again, as much as 75 per cent. and up to double, in addition to certain proportions of straw, as well as to perform a certain amount of manual or agricultural labour for their landlords. Besides these, there were numerous tenants at will, mostly residents of other villages, whose holding was on simple contracts entered into from year to year with the Khotes. The generality of these Conkanee cultivators were men of no capital whatever, and but very scanty clothing, living from hand to mouth, and literally subsisting on the mercy of their landlords. These were also often their tenants' bankers, and supplied them with their seed-grain, cattle, and agricultural implements, if not their daily food, recouping themselves at harvest-time from the produce of the tenants' fields. It was a class of people of this description whom the then heads of the Deccan Revenue Survey, accustomed up to that time to deal only with tenants holding directly from the State, endeavoured to elevate to the position of peasant-proprietors paying fixed rents, without reference to the varying rights they had hitherto possessed. Leases on certain terms, in substitution for annual settlements, were offered to the Khotes, who, naturally enough, refused to sign away their birthright. The Government of the day, notwithstanding the remonstrances of one of their most experienced officers, upheld the proceedings of the Survey; some hundreds of villages were placed under attachment, and managed for many years directly by the officers of the State. The Courts were flooded with litigation, rents remaining meanwhile heavily in arrears. This disgraceful state of affairs, which, among a more independent class of people than the Conkanees, would have bred a rebellion, continued until both sides were worn out, and a wiser frame of mind induced a more recent Government to retrace the steps of its predecessors, and endeavour to do common justice between man and man, by ascertaining and recording the actual relative rights of the Khotes and their tenants. Such was the state of matters when I left India, four years ago, and I have no doubt that by this time they have reached back to the stage which they ought never to have left, in which each had his own, the landlord bound by legalized custom to

take no more from his tenant than the rate fixed by the Survey settlement according to the actual records of the past; thus leaving the tenant the benefit of any improvements he might make by his own labour and out of his own capital, and the tenant who had no such existing and recorded limit to his rent, being left to the exercise of free contracting powers to protect himself. This is the exceptional case referred to at the head of this paper; and having referred to it with much regret, I am now happy to proceed to other cases where similar mistakes have not been made.

The Bhagdaree tenure in the Broach Collectorate, and the Nerwadaree in that of Kaira, are of cognate origin, and only differ somewhat in detail. Under other names, they resemble closely the Patidaree and other tenures of the North-west Provinces. The principal difference between the two consists in the rental of the villages held by the Bhagdars of Broach being calculated on the total assessment entered against their lands in the Government books, while the rentals of the Nerwadaree estates remain as they have been fixed from former days, and do not in all cases embrace the full assessments, the value of lapsed shares having, in some instances, been allowed to be deducted from the total demands of the State. In Bhagdaree villages the Bhagdars, or sharers, are not always of the same family, and occasionally not of the same caste; whereas Nerwadars are invariably Coonbees, and, I believe, more or less related to each other. This probably points to difference in origin, the Nerwadars being descendants of one ancestor; and holding their estates hereditarily from the first, and Bhagdars having in some instances been originally mere farmers, whose tenure in the course of time has become hereditary. In both cases, however, there are certain principal divisions of the estates, and these divisions are subdivided according to the custom of the different estates. Each principal sharer is responsible severally for the quota of rental falling on his share, whether the land included in it is held by himself, his sub-sharers, or by tenants of varying degrees of right and also responsible jointly with the other principal sharers for the rental of the whole estate. For instance, suppose an estate with a total rental of Rs. 1,000 to be sub-divided into four equal parts, assessed at Rs. 250 each, and held by A, B, C, and D. These four might have their shares sub-divided among five others, each holding land assessed at Rs. 50. If one of B's sub-sharers failed to pay his quota, and C, a principal sharer, also failed to meet his, A and D would have, jointly with B, to make up C's deficiency of Rs. 250, while B, in addition to this, would have to pay the Rs. 50 for which his sub-sharer

had become a defaulter. As a general rule, the lands in these villages are sub-divided not only according to the principal shares, but according to the sub-divisions also; whilst in some instances some lands are held jointly by all or some of the principal sharers, and their produce divided. Occasionally some of the village lands are not included in the Nerwa, although such is not the case in the Bhag. This has probably arisen from some share in the original Nerwa having been allowed to lapse, the principle of several and joint responsibility of all the shareholders for the total rental not having been strictly enforced. The tenants of such lands hold them directly from the State, as in ordinary villages, under the management of the officers of Government. The tenants in these villages, as in the Khotee villages, have different degrees of right in their holdings, from that of paying a perpetual fixed rent, or merely the same proportion of the total Government demands that the Nerwaders or Bhagdars themselves pay, to that of the mere tenant at will, holding according to immemorial village custom or contract with his superior holder. These sub-tenures, differently from the case of the Khotee villages, referred to above, have been in no way interfered with in the course of the Revenue Survey settlement. That settlement, the detailed method of assessment by which will be described hereafter, has re-fixed the total rentals of the estates according to the revised assessment, so that customary tenants entitled to hold at the same rates as the Nerwaders or Bhagdars themselves derive full benefit from the revision, while the latter, having to pay only according to the new valuation, are no losers. In respect to other tenants, their dealings with the superior holders are left to be settled by free contract. Whether this system might not to some extent be modified, with a view to attract capital to the soil, without unduly interfering with the proprietary rights of the superior holders or landlords, will be discussed presently, when the Survey settlement is described. There remains to be described the Talookdaree tenure of the Ahmedabad Collectorate. The Kusbatee estates, which may conveniently be classed with these, differ from them only in origin, and in the course of time have come to be held on the same tenure. The Kusbatees were Mussulmans who obtained farms of estates under the Mahomedan Kings of Goozerat, and gradually usurped proprietary rights in them; whereas the Talookdars were, for the most part, the original Rajpoot proprietors of theirs. There are also a few estates in the Kaira Collectorate called Oodhur-Jummabundy, or lump-rental paying properties, held by Coolies or Rajpoots, which now pay the same rentals that were found in existence at the time of the introduction of British rule, and have not come under the Survey

Settlement : these, therefore, require no further notice. It is curious to trace the gradual steps by which the Talookdaree estates, which are mostly situated in the part of the Ahmedabad Collectorate on the west and north-west of the Gulf of Cambay, have been converted from estates paying fluctuating tributes, determined arbitrarily by the amount of force or cunning brought to bear on either side, into quasi-farms of Government property, paying a certain proportion of their proceeds to the State. In the early days of British rule, when the *fortiter in re* was more in vogue than the *suaviter in modo* among the military men who were mostly appointed Collectors and Magistrates of newly acquired territories, an edict went forth that village accountants (Tulâtees) should be appointed to all Talookdaree villages. This order, fortunately for the possessors of the Oodhur-Jummabundy estates in Kaira, was issued only in the Western Zillah, or district north of the Myhee river, and therefore included only Ahmedabad. The appointment of such Government officers was a sore grievance to the almost independent petty Chiefs who held the estates, and was countermanded not long afterwards by Mountstuart Elphinstone, as Governor of Bombay, in about 1821. But the small end of the wedge had been inserted, and the independent character of the estates was gone. Inquiries began to be made as to the amount they ought to pay, and a proportion of the proceeds began to be thought of in place of a fluctuating tribute. One Collector reported that while the Talookdar levied from the tenant from one-third to one-half of his produce as a grain-rent, he should pay to the State up to two-thirds as his rental, evidently meaning that whatever the proceeds of the property might be, the Talookdar and the State should equally share them between them. The idea was at once seized upon that the proper proportion for the Talookdar to pay was invariably two-thirds : hence 70 per cent., even this being $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. more than the theoretical two-thirds, came to be the fixed proportion of the gross proceeds of their estates to be levied in future from the Talookdars. This heavy burden continued to be borne by the unfortunate victims of a misinterpreted official report until the introduction of a modified form of Survey settlement, after the lapse of about half a century, restored matters to their former position, as far as the proportion of rent to be paid over to the State was concerned. In the meanwhile, however, debts had accrued on the Talookdars' heads through payment, by means of borrowed money of unreasonable demands ; estates had remained under attachment, and under the management of the Revenue officer, for a couple of generations in some cases ; and a state of affairs had arisen, the sole and simple remedy for which appeared to be the removal of the estates from the

jurisdiction of the ordinary Law Courts, the settlement of the Talookdars' debts by a special independent officer, and the management of the estates by him until the sums thus arrived at had been liquidated out of their proceeds. Full proprietary title, subject to payment of 50 per cent. of the gross revenues of the estates, having been conceded to the Talookdars, it remains to be seen how they will fare when left again to shift for themselves. My own opinion is that, as the Talookdars, as a class, are uneducated and improvident, as well as to a great extent demoralized by the vice of opium-eating, they will gradually disappear as landlords, and sink, as many of the junior branches already have, to the level of common cultivators. The sub-tenures of the estates, with which no interference has been permitted; carry within themselves the seeds of decay; for, although the system of succession by primogeniture prevails among them, the junior members of each family and all widows and connections, to an almost unlimited degree of relationship, expect to have a livelihood provided for them out of the estate; so that in the course of a few generations the State will have to look for its dues to men occupying the position of landlords with inadequate resources from which to meet them. It is evident that in such cases the Government will sooner or later have to interfere to make the holders of such maintenance lands contribute their quota towards the payment of the general rental, unless another Malthus should appear and persuade these Rajpoots of the immorality of having too numerous a progeny. Curiously enough, the pride of the people themselves has to a great extent operated in this very direction, by filling the houses of many of them with maiden daughters, unmarriedable in consequence of the inability of their parents to provide them with sufficient dowries to admit of their wedding in their own station, and unwilling to allow them to marry men of inferior social position.

There are a few estates in the north-eastern part of the Ahmedabad Collectorate, held by Coolies and Rajpoots, which have from the first continued to pay lump rentals, regulated chiefly by custom and not calculated according to a fixed percentage of proceeds. These have lately been roughly surveyed and assessed, for the purpose of procuring some data on which to fix payments in future; and it will need close supervision on the part of the Government to prevent the local authorities from gradually introducing the idea of a fixed proportion of the proceeds of the estates into the calculation of the demands of the State. Were this idea to be once introduced, it is easy to predict that these Mehwassee estates (the name being derived from the word Mehwas, a wild, uncivilized tract of country) will gradually follow in the path of the Talookdaree estates described above.

But of far more importance than all the above to the great mass of the agricultural population of the Presidency is the tenure provided by the Revenue Survey Settlement, and I trust I shall not weary my hearers by entering somewhat in detail into a description of the processes by which the assessment under that tenure is finally arrived at.

The first operation is, naturally, the measurement of the land. This is carried out in the minutest detail. Theoretically, the land is parcelled out into blocks capable of being cultivated by one or two ploughs; but, practically, regard has to be paid to existing occupancies, the boundaries of which have to be adhered to, and which, although they may be included in Survey numbers of larger area, have invariably separate assessments placed upon them. These measurements are made with the chain and cross-staff, checked as to the boundaries of villages, and tested for accuracy in calculation of areas, by the theodolite. The unit of measurement is the English statute acre. Each plot, as measured, is plotted on a map, which is made up for each village by the fields being fitted on to each other. The unit for classification of soils and assessment is the Survey field or number in the village register.

Measurement being completed, the soil of each field has to be classified, with a view to the value of each relatively to that of other fields being approximately determined. This, it need hardly be said, is not accomplished by any chemical analysis, but by the practical method, attained to by experience, of ascertaining the existence in the soil of elements causing it to deteriorate in fertility. Such elements are want of depth from the surface, excess of sand, stones, or lime, too great a slope, such as to cause washing away by rain, the presence of salt, &c.; all faults actually visible to the practised eye. The process is the descending one of searching for deteriorating influences, the converse of chemical analysis, by which fertilising properties may also be discovered. A good field, of full depth of soil, with good mould unmixed with stones, salt, &c., being taken at sixteen annas, the top of the scale; another, containing too much sand or of insufficient depth, would be debited with one or more faults, and classed at fourteen annas, twelve annas, and so on, in a descending scale. Uniformity in the debiting of faults is secured by the classers working under the eye of a superior officer, who tests their work from time to time. The accuracy with which the operation is carried out would astonish any one unaccustomed to see the work. I have myself seen a whole village in the black soil plains of Goozerat classified so that there was hardly a variation of one-sixteenth throughout it between the different fields, and the classi-

fication was verified by the remarkably even out-turn of the crops. It will be as well to repeat that the object of this method of classification is to fix the relative values of soils, and thus, when a maximum assessment has been determined upon for a district, to provide for lands classified at the various anna rates falling into their natural position with regard to their positive rates of assessment. Measurement and classification of soils having been completed, and registers of every field marked and numbered on the village maps, with their classification values provided, the work of the Settling Officer in fixing the assessment commences. I must not omit to mention here, as the matter has a considerable bearing on the question of an equitable assessment, that the register also contains an entry against each survey number of its distance from the village site and from water; the importance of this will be explained presently. The fixing of a maximum rate of assessment for a district, I need hardly say, involves the consideration of many points, and calls for the exercise on the part of the Superintendent of Survey, or Settlement Officer, as the case may be, of no ordinary degree of judgment and foresight. On the one hand, if the rate fixed is too low, a very serious loss of revenue to the State for the whole period of the Survey settlement—thirty years—is involved; on the other hand, if the rate is too high, the tenants suffer. But again, the interests of the State being bound up in those of its subjects, it is more politic, in endeavouring to reconcile the conflicting interests of the two sides, to lean to that of moderation. Returns of past assessment, of what has been realized under it, and what arrears have accumulated, of the difficulty or otherwise with which the revenue has been collected, of the effect the assessment has had on the area under cultivation, and on the general condition of the people, of the rise or fall in the general value of agricultural produce, of the area of land still remaining uncultivated, and likely to be brought under the plough, so as to recoup any temporary loss of revenue, are all more or less guides in determining the future maximum pitch of assessment. The relative value of particular tracts of country or individual villages must be determined by considerations of climate, of constancy or uncertainty of rainfall, of the situation of roads and markets in existence, and the probability of the rise of other markets. How far each of these considerations should be taken into account, and how far returns of actual out-turn of crops that may be available should be allowed to influence the decision of the Settlement Officer, are points on which no particular rules can be laid down. The matter must be left to the judgment of the officer entrusted with the duty, under the general control of his superiors in

offi , and of the Government. The one golden rule in all cases is that of moderation of demand.

When the maximum rate of a district has been determined, its application generally in the villages comprised in the district may be influenced by a consideration of the prevalent character of the husbandry of the cultivators. Suppose, for instance, half a district to be inhabited by cultivators of a race inferior in industry, in capital, and in agricultural skill to those in the remainder. Although the natural fertility of the soil and other circumstances affecting the general level of assessment in the two sub-divisions of the district might be equal, it might be politic to lower the maximum for the former below that for the latter, with a view to give the inferior cultivators, as a body, the opportunity of competing on more equal terms with their better-to-do neighbours. But I cannot conceive any plan of settlement more inequitable than that said to have been recently adopted by some of the Assistant Commissioners under the Land Act in Ireland, of looking to the condition of individual tenants in fixing the rents they are to pay in future. Any attempt, in fact, to look at single farms or at individual cases without checking conclusions by more general views of the circumstances of large tracts of country, must, it appears to me, be misleading. I must not, however, talk English politics in the present assembly.

I mentioned just now the entry in the village registers of the distance of each field from the village site and from water. Both these considerations must affect the relative value towards each other of the fields in a village. The owner of a field where water can only be procured for man and beast at a great distance has to stop work for a considerable time during the day in order to go to the water, and possibly loses an hour or two, which he would be saved if the source of his water-supply were close at hand ; this, therefore, in an arid climate such as that of the Deccan is a point of no little importance. Again, if a field is close to the village site, it is far more accessible for the conveyance of manure, always stored in the village itself, and more convenient for the watching and storing of crops, for weeding them, and guarding them against the ravages of birds, deer, &c., than one on the outskirts, possibly several miles off, would be, and is consequently more valuable. It is, therefore, a matter for the judgment of the assessing officer to raise or lower rates of assessment accordingly; but this, it cannot be too often repeated, must not be done capriciously with reference to single fields ; the whole of the land in a reasonably large tract of country must rise or fall in assessment together, or the rents fixed will infallibly prove inequitable.

After all the necessary calculations have been made, the accounts are simplified by adding on or taking off annas and pies, so as to make even sums in rupees, and the total sums due on each Survey number are apportioned on the several ryots' plots included in it according to their areas. The settlement is then ready to be introduced. An account of each man's holding in acres and rupees, contrasted with his former area and assessment, is drawn up by the village accountant, and explained to him in the presence of the assembled villagers, only the Survey total being levied if it proves to be less than the old total, and the excess of the former being remitted if it is heavier. Then the new assessment on each number is explained to the holders, and they have the option of taking them or throwing them up. The opportunity of the villagers being assembled is taken to rectify any mistakes that may have occurred in drawing up the record of holdings, and disputes between claimants are also summarily settled. It may be said that this is a very rough and ready method of settling disputes, but every one who has attended the introduction of a settlement can vouch for it that it is effective. The fact is that the matter is fairly settled as between man and man, with their fellow-villagers acting as arbitrators, and I have never known the Survey record in such cases disputed, although it is, of course, open to question in a court of law. All Survey settlements are guaranteed against increase for thirty years, and the Survey and Settlement Act distinctly provides that any increase in assessment that may be made at the end of that time shall only be so on general considerations not due to the expenditure of capital or the application of labour by the tenant himself; that is to say, that it can be only on the unearned increment. The transfer of holdings from one man to another is an operation of the simplest nature, so that sale or mortgage can be effected without difficulty. A simple petition has to be presented to the Mamlutdar, or Tehsceldar, as he would be called in other parts of India, from A, the holder, that he desires to transfer a certain number, or share of a number, to B, and B, at the foot of the same petition, agrees to accept the transfer; the village books are altered accordingly, and the transaction is complete.

Such is the Bombay Revenue Survey system, which, *pace* the advocates of the village settlement system, provides as favourable a tenure, consistently with the right of the State to derive a fair land-tax from its domains, as can well be conceived. It guarantees full proprietary title to the tenant on condition of payment of a moderate land-tax fixed for a generation, at the same time not binding him to retain his entire holding if circumstances should make it desirable for

him at any time to relinquish the whole or any part of it. On the expiration of the guaranteed period, and, in fact, for ever, it leaves the full benefit of any improvements he may make in it in the hands of himself and his heirs. The same terms are guaranteed to the holders of estates such as those described above, with the exception that the rentals of the entire estates must remain intact, and the right of the holders of such estates to make their own contracts with all tenants who do not hold on tenures adverse to those of the landlords or proprietors, is in no way interfered with. The occasion referred to above, in which I have expressed a doubt as to whether it might not be advisable for the tenure of sub-tenants to be improved in such estates, is that of a tenant, being able and desirous to expend capital in improvements to his land, holding under a landlord not possessed of the requisite capital. On such an occasion I do not think it would be an undue interference with a landlord's rights to permit an improving tenant to expend capital, after giving due notice to his landlord, and allowing the latter fair time in which to make the desired improvement himself, if he should be desirous of doing so. It appears to me to go beyond a tenant's right to allow him to make such improvements for himself without a fair opportunity being given to the landlord to make them and derive legitimate benefits from them.

On the introduction of a Survey settlement, the general character of the crops usually raised in different villages is considered, with a view to the instalments by which the collections of revenue are to be made being fixed for such dates as may give time to the cultivators to harvest and sell their crops, and thus save them from the necessity of applying to money-lenders for advances. Taking the whole process of the settlement into consideration, I do not think any reasonable person can deny that the utmost trouble is taken to insure the demands of the State being fixed at a fair rate, and to give the ryots every security in the employment of their labour and capital in the improvement of their properties. A peasant proprietary has here been created on a sufficiently large scale for its effects on the condition of the people to be clearly seen, and the experience of rather more than one generation, during which the experiment has been in progress, shows that it results in the survival of the fittest. A provident man makes the best of the opportunity afforded him, and thrives; an improvident man, on the other hand, finds himself in possession of a valuable security, which he makes use of to raise money with, but gradually gets more and more out of his depth in debt, and his creditor steps in and becomes his landlord. There can be no reasonable doubt that in due time, and that at no distant date, the Deccan ryots, to save whom

from ruin an endeavour is now being made in Bombay, will find themselves the serfs of the money-lending community, for they are of the improvident class. For the Coonbees in Goozerat the settlement offers an opportunity for bettering their condition, which they will not be slow to avail themselves of, until the pressure of population on the soil and the gradual accumulation of agricultural capital produces its natural result of separating the heads from the hands, and dissipates the idea, which I fear the Irish peasantry have too eagerly seized upon, that there can exist a community in which all can be heads and none need be hands. In village communities the heads already exist, and will gradually absorb the lands held by their sub-tenants, reducing these to the position of labourers as soon as the lands in their villages become insufficient for the support of the superior holders and their families in the degree of comfort to which they have been accustomed. There is a point beyond which the influence of legislation will not reach, and however wise and expedient such legislation as that lately decided on in the case of ryots in India and peasants in Ireland may appear to be, it will cease to have effect the moment it comes in contact with natural laws.

The CHAIRMAN intimated that it was open for any one to make remarks upon the paper they had just heard; but as time was limited, he had to ask that speakers would put some curb upon their eloquence.

Mr. P. PIRIE GORDON said he must thank Mr. Rogers for the excellent and able paper he had just read. He confessed his regret at not seeing in attendance a larger number of the agricultural community of this country, for Mr. Rogers' paper contained matter which both tenants and landlords at home might equally consider with advantage. Without entering at all into politics in relation to the question, he might be permitted to say that England, Scotland, and certainly Ireland, might derive benefit from the study of the subject of land tenures and land produce in India. (Hear, hear.) As far as he could gather, the Government of India holds very much the position of the landlords of this country. The question now, both for landlords and for tenants, is, by what means land can be used most beneficially, and how it can be most easily, cheaply, and securely transferred from one man to another. It would appear that in India this problem has been solved in a very simple and efficacious way. He would like to ask the author of the paper whether the village registers are so easily arranged as to obviate frequent misunderstand-

ings as to boundaries and landmarks, because that is a point which is just now of great importance. At present it is simply impossible for a landlord in this country—owing to our feudal system—to transfer easily small portions of land to his tenants. He believed it would be found a great advantage both to landlords and tenants that a system of peasant proprietary (to a moderate extent) should exist; by which he meant a system enabling people of active, industrious habits to acquire small tenures of from five to ten acres which they could occupy mainly for the cultivation of fruit and vegetables. The community at large would be much benefited by such a system, and so would all concerned. It would, of course, be impossible for a peasant proprietary in this country to live and bring up their families upon the same scale as that adopted by the larger farmers; nor could the agriculture be of the same character. But where the cultivation could be by hand labour, as in India, and by deep spade labour for gardening purposes, with the accompaniment of a cow, pigs, and poultry, he believed a man in this country could bring up his family well upon five or six acres if he were the proprietor. He understood that in many parts of India the villages, as a whole community, were engaged in some such occupation, and that they not only managed to live themselves, but to bring up their families in comparative decency and comfort. If that can be done in England, and the transfer of land made secure and cheap from man to man and tenant to tenant, thus enabling a large proprietor to transfer small portions at little cost and without difficulty, he believed it would be of incalculable advantage. In fine, he thought they could learn much that was worth copying in the Indian land system. In conclusion, Mr. Gordon repeated his thanks to Mr. Rogers.

Colonel RATHBORNE said he had not been in India since the settlement of Madras. No doubt the measurements of village holdings, and so forth, on which the Government settlements were based, were conducted by men of the greatest integrity, and there might be reason to hope that eventually the system would work well, but at the time when he was in India it certainly did not work well. The reason was obvious—that persons fitted for properly carrying it out were not available. The Native subordinates were for the greater part excessively corrupt, and few Europeans could be had for the work, as they were engaged in other duties. The first survey was that made under Mr. Pringle. After not a very long time, that went altogether, as it was found to be entirely defective. Men who were charged with large quantities of land had really very little; others who were only

charged with small quantities really held very large lots. In fact, the whole system was so corrupt that it was obliged to be thoroughly revised. The next survey was the one begun under Goldsmid. After some time it was discovered that that would not work, and for exactly the same reason that operated against Pringle's—namely, that it was almost impossible to get Natives free from corrupt influences to carry out the work. After that, the survey was conducted under Wingate, and he (Colonel Rathborne) believed it succeeded to some extent, certainly much more than it had done previously. Wingate was a very able man; he enjoyed the confidence and esteem of the Natives, and was therefore better able to impose checks on dishonesty than was possible with those who preceded him. But, after all, it was a failure. It was no use shutting our eyes to the fact that there was a feature in that settlement which rendered it impossible for any Native to become a prosperous tenant under it. It declared that up to thirty years there should not be a greater addition than 5 per cent. on the actual revenue—under no circumstances would that be exceeded; but at the expiration of the thirty years the result (as he had prophesied it would be) was that the quantity of additional assessment fixed on the holdings was such that a large proportion was put altogether out of cultivation. It was not more than about eight or nine years ago since an Act was passed or an order issued in Bombay which provided that in future revisions of the assessment no increase made after the thirty years had expired should extend to more than 100 per cent. of the actual revenue. That showed what an enormous increase there had been to that time; in fact, he believed that in nearly every holding the increased assessment amounted really to 150, instead of 100 per cent. He would like to have Mr. Rogers' views on these points. The system, as theoretically devised, was an admirable one, but it could not be denied that in practice it was inadequate, in consequence of the difficulty in carrying it out properly, the Government being so much dependent upon Natives for the means of doing so, and the European officers who fixed the rentals having practically no limit placed to their powers. It was obviously unadvisable that these officers should have the power of doubling the assessments if they thought fit, they being, of course, biassed insensibly by the feeling that the larger the addition made to the settlement the more favourable would be the estimate formed of their abilities as Settlement officers. The Settlement officer was the servant of the Government, and not the servant of the people, and therefore his interests were antagonistic to those of the people. (Hear, hear.) In conclusion, Colonel Rathborne expressed his thanks to Mr. Rogers for his very able and interesting address.

Mr. W. MARTIN WOOD thanked Mr. Rogers for his clear and distinct explanation of the subject. Only those who had attained some familiarity with the literature of Indian Survey and Settlement Reports could appreciate the conciseness and precision of Mr. Rogers' paper; but he would venture to remark that eleven pages of Mr. Rogers' fourteen are occupied by descriptions of the older tenures and local or quasi-proprietary rights. This was doubtless necessary for the attainment of the object in view—the correction of the misapprehension as to the too sweeping and wholly tenant-right nature of the Bombay Survey system. Mr. Rogers had clearly shown that the special holdings and sub-proprietary rights have been respected. Nevertheless, to a stranger the proportion of Mr. Rogers' paper taken up by the consideration of the special tenures would convey a wrong impression with regard to their extent, as against the extent of country under the Bombay system. Should Mr. Rogers be revising his paper, it would be well that this proportion should be made more plain, and the great preponderance under the ryots' settlement more clearly shown. Probably these special tenures did not comprise more than one-seventh or one-eighth of the whole of the land of the Bombay Presidency. As to the Bombay Survey system, he would say, with all deference to what had fallen from Colonel Rathborne, that he believed it to be by far the best land system ever devised. In the words of Mr. Rogers, “it provides as favourable a tenure, consistently
 “with the right of the State to derive a fair land tax from its
 “domains, as can well be conceived. It guarantees full proprietary
 “title to the tenant on condition of payment of a moderate land tax
 “fixed for a generation, at the same time not binding him to retain
 “his entire holding if circumstances should make it desirable for him
 “at any time to relinquish the whole or any part of it.” If those principles are carried out as they have been generously designed, there is only one possibility of mistake, and that is in taking too much of the “unearned increment” by the assessment, and leaving too little to the cultivator as his share. Some beneficiary interest in the soil is the undoubted immemorial right of the cultivator in all parts of India; and with this fact of hereditary popular rights as regards “unearned increment” kept well in view and duly regarded, he would maintain that the Bombay system is as complete and successful a system as was ever devised. But it might be said by those who had heard of the agrarian troubles and disorders in the Deccan, and of the temper of the people elsewhere, “How does this exist concurrently with a so-called
 “perfect land system?” Well, that was really a very large ques-

tion, the adequate reply to which would involve considerations that time would not permit to enter upon. But he might say that the evils to which he had referred—the agrarian troubles in the Deccan—were due to an anomalous condition affecting India as a whole, one that is felt by the ryots more than any others as a class, because they provide a large part of the revenue of the State, and have to find cash to pay their assessments. This anomalous condition, this constant force, though unseen and intangible, is fearfully real in its results. It consists in the fact that India is ruled by an alien Government, whose necessities require a large annual withdrawal from the resources of India itself. (Hear, hear.) Speaking as one who had studied the subject for many years, he avowed his firm conviction that this was the only possible explanation of the striking anomaly that the best land system ever devised, with tenant-right provided, and the cultivators' wages and profits secured, is concurrent with frequent agrarian distress and absence of rural prosperity. The evil arose from a state of things entirely outside the land system; it originates in a polity which cannot easily be altered, but which, nevertheless, must some day be faced and provided for in some way. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Wood again referred to the great pleasure and interest he had felt while Mr. Rogers was addressing the meeting—feelings which were enhanced by the recollection that it had been his (Mr. Wood's) good fortune to see him at work in Goozerat making one of those settlements of which he had given a description, and availing himself with the utmost solicitude, as described in the paper, of all local evidence to arrive at a proper judgment. Mr. Rogers—as those who were acquainted with the Bombay Presidency need not be reminded—is one of the class of Bombay Civilians who has been accustomed to pay more attention than some others to the claims and privileges of the hereditary proprietary landowners. Mr. Wood added, that it had been his position to stand between these two classes of Civilians, and owned that they could appreciate and respect the motives of both without sharing the opinions of extremists on either side. But of Mr. Rogers it was only just to say that he was a good example of the Bombay Civilian not given to extremes, and his conclusions were therefore entitled to all the more respect.

Mr. ALEXANDER ROGERS, replying to the remarks made in the course of the discussion, said: The first question that was asked me was as to whether the village registers would be so arranged as to admit with facility the transfer of small pieces of land. Perhaps I failed by my paper to convey to the minds of my hearers that every-

thing is carried out to the minutest particular. When a surveyor goes into the field to measure, he first of all ascertains the exact holdings of the different tenants as they exist. Then, for the theoretical purposes of the survey, as I said—in order, as far as possible, to carry out the theory of throwing sufficient land into one Survey number to be cultivated by one or two ploughs—the holdings of a number of tenants (four or five, or perhaps six) may be thrown together into one Survey number, which Survey number is not only marked off on the village map so that it can be traced, but it has boundary marks put round its edges. At all corners of the field there would be large mounds of earth or stone pointing in the direction in which the boundaries run. In addition to that, the law is that between these boundaries there shall be strips of waste land, and any infraction of these boundaries is penal. Each separate plot within the Survey number being thus accurately measured, and its assessment separately recorded in the register, it is traceable in the field as well as in the books; and, therefore, the transfer is a matter of the greatest facility. With reference to the remarks of the next speaker (Colonel Rathborne) with regard to the survey in its earliest stages, I am sorry to say that to a certain extent I must agree with him. When the survey first commenced, as we can easily imagine, it was a most complicated matter for anybody to understand. In the time of Mr. Pringle it was not carried out with the exactness that was afterwards exhibited under Goldsmid and Wingate. It was only when the latter gentlemen got to work that the matter was reduced to a system. But I can answer for this from long experience, that after Wingate's system was introduced, the matter really became almost a mechanical process. The fields are marked out so precisely, and the maps must be drawn so exactly to scale, that it is impossible that any land can escape notice. Every portion of it is plotted to scale, and, therefore, any land that is put down in a tenant's holding in excess of what he actually has must be detected if the Survey officers do their duty. After the measurement takes place, there is a subsequent process before the maps are fairly drawn. Every measurement taken for each field is most thoroughly gone through during the monsoon months, and every calculation of area is checked. It is, therefore, almost a matter of impossibility that any land can escape survey, and I think it is quite impossible that any land can be assigned to a tenant which he has not actually got. If it should escape notice at that time, when the settlement is to be introduced every ryot in the place is present. If he knows—and most of the ryots are of perfectly sufficient intelligence to know—that he has, say, an acre of land, and he has

been debited with two or three acres, he is not foolish enough not to come forward there and then, and say, "I have not that quantity of land." He knows perfectly well what land he has, and the fullest explanations are given at the Survey settlement, as the fields are not only recorded by numbers, but the names by which they are currently and locally known are explained to the ryots. Every field in the village, as most Anglo-Indians well know, is known not only by its number in the Survey registers, but also by a local name. Each local name is explained to the ryots themselves. The headmen or patels, and the village accountants, and the Survey officers are all there on the spot, and it is almost a matter of impossibility that there can be a mistake made. I acknowledge that there may be some slight errors in the classification of the soils, but this also is reduced almost to a mechanical process. After a very long experience, extending now over thirty years and more, the method of classification has become so thoroughly well known that the classing officer going into a village, by checking the classification here and there without letting the classer know where he is going to do so, can invariably check the classification and prevent its going wrong to any great extent. I would venture to say that in any ordinary village, unless there is something very extraordinarily difficult in the classification, there would hardly in any case be more than a difference of a sixteenth between the classification put upon the land by the classer and that put upon it by the superior classing officer. I have had hundreds, I might almost say thousands, of villages pass through my hands, and have had the classers work before me individually and questioned them in every way. I have been through the whole of the field operations myself, and can really guarantee that there is very little chance of any great mistake taking place. Of course, Natives are not infallible; bribery may take place; but I am quite certain that it has been now reduced to a minimum. It is the case that a large increase of assessment took place on the revision of some portion of the Deccan collectorates, and I should like to explain that. The settlements that came under revision some six or seven years ago were the early settlements of Pringle, which were revised under Goldsmid and Wingate. They were settled really before a proper system had been established, and the large increase of assessment has taken place in this way. At the time when the first settlements were introduced the prices of agricultural produce were very low indeed, and the result was that the classers measured into the Survey numbers an immense quantity of land which really was very good land, classifying it either at a nominal rate or as worth-

less. Within the thirty years the value of agricultural produce had doubled or trebled, and the result of that had been that those lands which had been classified as worthless—as unarable—were actually found to be in cultivation, and to be bearing large produce. Nobody could say that that was an improvement, such as the tenants ought to have been entitled to hold for ever rent free; and it was mainly on that account that the large increase in assessment took place. It was frequently found that a man who was put down in the original survey as holding, say, one acre of land, actually held one acre of arable and two acres of so-called unarable land—that is, three acres, of which only one acre had been assessed. When we came to revise the settlement we found that the whole three acres were really arable land, and it was for that reason that the assessment increased so greatly. It was really not in consequence of placing increased assessment; in fact, we were forbidden by law to assess any land that had been improved, for this merely bringing into cultivation land which ought not to have been considered unarable was really no improvement. A limit has been fixed to the assessment. I am not quite certain what it is, but I think the utmost limit is now 50 per cent. over the original; and that could only take place in those instances in which the first survey measurement and classification had been carried out under the old system before it was properly revised—before, in fact, there was anything like the system there is now. Mr. Wood said that my paper did not show exactly the proportion of population to which the Survey settlement applied as distinguished from the holdings under the other different tenures described. He said it might be that the Goozerattee tenures and the Khotee tenures embraced, perhaps, one-eighth. I should think he has rather overstated the real proportions, as probably nine-tenths of the ryots in the whole of the Bombay Presidency are under the Survey settlement, and not more than one-tenth under other tenures. I think these few remarks cover the whole of the questions that were asked me. (Cheers.)

Mr. ARTHUR MALET, while thanking Mr. Rogers for his able paper, supplemented by the very full explanations he had given, wished to remark on the reflections which seemed to be cast by one of the speakers upon the Revenue survey originally commenced by Mr. Pringle. Mr. Pringle was a Bombay Civilian of great ability, and was chosen expressly for his fitness for the superintendence of the Revenue survey by Mountstuart Elphinstone—no mean judge of character. Mr. Pringle was considered to be one of the most able men then in

the Service ; but at that time there were no means of obtaining subordinates qualified to carry out the details. (Hear, hear.) But his work was the commencement of the survey which it has taken thirty years to bring to the perfection which Mr. Rogers now said it has attained. Under those circumstances he thought it unjust that any reflection should be cast upon the character of the gentleman who first began, under the greatest difficulties, the Revenue settlement of the Bombay Presidency. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. A. ROGERS said he perfectly agreed with the remarks of Mr. Malet. Mr. Pringle, no doubt, had to face difficulties which were now wholly removed, and he ascribed the failure of Mr. Pringle simply to the circumstances of the time.

Colonel RATHBORNE explained that nothing could have been further from his desire than to have cast the slightest slur upon Mr. Pringle. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Pringle was a most able man ; his qualities were everything that could be desired ; the esteem which he gained in every position he filled fully justified the confidence which the Government placed in him—(hear, hear)—but Mr. Pringle was only mortal ; he was obliged to do the best he could with the materials at his command, and, like a number of other able men, he was misled by the corruption of those who were the only persons on whom he could rely.

The CHAIRMAN, summing up the discussion, said it must be admitted that Mr. Rogers had satisfactorily answered the several questions, and explained the doubts or objections suggested by some of the speakers upon various parts of his paper. With reference to the remarks of the last speaker, Mr. Malet, and to what had fallen from Colonel Rathborne, he would only say that the name of Pringle, the first worker upon the Bombay Settlement, and those of his able successors, Goldsmid, Wingate, and, later on, Anderson, are familiar in every province of India, and have become, no doubt, household words in the Presidency of Bombay, as the names of men who initiated and carried through that great and admirable work. (Hear, hear.) If we regarded the various measures of a similar character that have been undertaken and brought to a successful issue in every part of India, the years they occupied, and the volumes in which they are recorded, we must admit that they are lasting monuments of patient industry and laborious research ; and it will be well for us and for India if the main object of our rulers shall con-

tinue to be what it was in olden times—to fix such light assessments and to make such laws as will encourage agricultural improvement and raise the condition of the cultivators of the soil. (Cheers.

On the motion of Mr. P. PIRIE GORDON, a vote of thanks was accorded to both Chairman and Lecturer, and the sitting then terminated.

Indian and other Foreign Productions in Silver, and why they are virtually Prohibited from Importation into the United Kingdom.

A PAPER READ BEFORE THE EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION

By EDWARD J. WATHERSTON, Esq.,

ON WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 18TH, 1882.

THE RIGHT HON. SIR ARTHUR HOBHOUSE, Q.C., K.C.S.I.,
IN THE CHAIR.

A MEETING of the members and friends of the East India Association, together with many others specially interested in the Silver Trade, was held in Doughty Hall, at the rear of the Association's Offices, 14, Bedford Row, on Wednesday evening, January 18th, 1882, the subject for consideration being "Indian and other Foreign Productions in Silver, and why they are virtually Prohibited from Importation into the United Kingdom," introduced in an address by Edward J. Watherston, Esq., of Pall Mall East.

The Right Hon. Sir ARTHUR HOBHOUSE, Q.C., K.C.S.I., C.I.E., occupied the chair, and amongst those present were the following: Colonel Macdonald; Captain W. P. Buckham, R.N.; Mr. Thomas H. Thornton, C.S.I.; Mr. B. Arnott; Mr. A. Balanu; Mr. G. T. Biddulph; Mr. J. M. Chapman; Mr. W. H. Collins; Mr. J. F. Dalrymple; Mr. A. T. Dickson; Mr. John W. Elliot; Mr. T. H. Farrer (Permanent Secretary of the Board of Trade); Mr. H. W. Fincham; Mrs. G. Fischer; Mr. Alfred Freman; Mr. H. W. Fox; Mr. F. B. Garnett (Inland Revenue); Mr. A. H. Griffiths; Mr. A. J. Griffiths; Mr. B. Griffiths; Mr. Henry Gringer; Mr. S. H. Hagon; Mr. George Hicks; Mr. R. M. Holborn; Mr. Jackson; Mr. W. James; Mr. J. H. Johns; Mr. F. W. Jones; Mr. C. Kily; Mr. Alfred Loewenstein; Mr. Edward Loewenstein; Mr. W. Mackenzie; Mr. Arthur Malet; Mr. William McGuffin; Mr. Charles W. McMinn, (B.C.S.); Mr. F. G. Millington; Mr. C. Miller; Mr. L. Muller; Mr. J. W. Paine; Mr. A. H. Paton; Mr. Alfred Pelly; Mr. John Pillar; Mr. T. E. Pinchback; Mr. T. J. Pinchback; Mr. James U. Poole; Mr. Rasmeissen; Mr. W. Reeves; Mr. Richard Sanderson;

Mr. George Stewart; Mr. James Taylor; Mr. T. Taylor; Mr. Henry Watherston; Mr. A. Webster; Mr. A. Wolfers; Mr. W. Carlton Wood; Mr. W. Martin Wood; Mr. W. Hamilton Burn, Acting Secretary, &c., &c.

In opening the proceedings the Right Hon. CHAIRMAN said he did not think it any part of the duty of the Chairman upon an occasion like the present, when there was a lecture to be delivered, and, as they hoped, a discussion to follow, to attempt to forestal the subject in a preliminary speech. He considered it to be the duty of the Chairman to guide the discussion, and, if necessary, to sum it up. If, indeed, it had been necessary for the Chairman to forestal the lecturer, then he must frankly confess that they would not have seen him in the chair, for he must own to being exceedingly ignorant of the subject to be considered that evening, and to having come in the expectation of being instructed by Mr. Watherston. Mr. Watherston, as no doubt most of those present were aware, is a very active member of London society, is a member of the Cobden Club, the British Association, the Social Science Association, and of, in fact, all sorts of combinations of good men for promoting good works; and he has paid great attention to the special subject upon which he was to address them. The Chairman added that Mr. Watherston had made one special preparation for the meeting. He had acted the part of a prudent general, and upon the well-known maxim of quartering upon the enemy; he had, in fact, fortified himself before coming to the meeting by a dinner in the Hall of the Goldsmiths' Company. (Laughter.)

Mr. EDWARD J. WATHERSTON then read the following paper:—

My thanks are due to the Council of this Association for their kindness in affording me an opportunity, of which I gladly avail myself, for the purpose of explaining the fiscal and other hindrances which beset the British manufacturers of silver plate, and which virtually prohibit the importation of Indian and other foreign silver wares into the United Kingdom. It must often have occurred to colonists, Anglo-Indians more especially, that it is strange that the beautiful workmanship of native productions in silver, to be found not only in India, but also in Japan, should not be appreciated in England. It is but little known that this supposed want of appreciation is wholly caused by prevailing legislation. It has rightly been said that such hindrances are unjust, impolitic, subversive of the principles of modern

fiscal legislation, obstructive to art progress, and an insurmountable obstacle to technical education in its application to silversmiths' work.

The injustice is manifest, seeing that no other similar trade is taxed, and that the modern silversmith has to compete with the electro-plate manufacturer, who, by a strange anomaly, is permitted to assume marks for his wares so closely resembling the hall-mark upon the genuine silver article as not to be distinguishable at arm's length; while, at the same time, he is at perfect liberty to make goods of any quality he may please. He is also under no necessity to take out a licence, which in the case of a silversmith amounts to the sum of 5*l.* 15*s.* per annum. The impolicy of such hindrances is, unhappily, but too apparent; the trade is rapidly falling in amount. In 1855, the weight of silver upon which duty was paid amounted to 994,360 ounces; in 1859, this had fallen to 801,680 ounces; in 1877, to 798,206 ounces; in 1880, to 638,620 ounces. Thus, in a period of about a quarter of a century, during a time of unparalleled national prosperity, the output of the British silversmith has fallen by an amount of 355,000 ounces, or by more than one-third, representing a loss of at least 180,000*l.* of wholesale trade annually. I am aware that it may rightly be argued that there are manifest reasons for the decline in the silver trade—viz., the admitted fact that electro-plate has, in a large measure, supplanted silver plate; that the cost of the former, even of the most expensive description, is far less than that of the latter; and that a great number of persons, although fully able to afford to purchase articles of great value—such as diamonds and other precious stones, pictures, and articles of *vertu*—prefer electro-plate, as being less liable to robbery. Country people, of highest rank and property, frequently offer these objections to the use of silver plate. But I regard such objections as only more clearly demonstrating my argument. If it be true, and no one would be disposed to deny it, that the electro-plater has such advantages over the silversmith, it follows that, as a measure of simple justice to the silversmith, taxation of silver plate should have been abolished twenty-five years ago, upon the introduction of electro-plate. It is enough for the silversmith to have to compete with the natural advantages of a rival industry; assuredly, he ought not to be “weighted” further by fiscal and other hindrances to progress.

But I maintain that there is another, and far greater, reason for the rapid decline in the trade of the silversmith; I allude to the decadence of “art” as applied to its manufacture. It is somewhat humiliating to myself, as a silversmith, to confess this, but, as it will

be my endeavour to show that it principally results from unjust and impolitic laws, it may be said to reflect but little discredit upon the members of my craft.

John Stuart Mill* justly says: "It is a well-known fact that the branches of production in which fewest improvements are made are those with which the Revenue officer interferes; and that nothing, in general, gives a greater impulse to improvements in the production of a commodity than taking off a tax which narrowed the market for it." The same author remarks: "Any regulations whatever, enforced by law, make it difficult for the producer to adopt new and improved processes."

It is noteworthy that these philosophical remarks of the greatest of modern economists have been reflected, it may truly be said unanimously, by the Press, when referring to the silver trade: the following may be quoted as a sample of the editorial comments which have lately appeared in all parts of the country. The *Sheffield and Rotherham Independent* says: "Under a mischievous fiscal policy, the English silver trade is becoming more and more decrepit. The protection to which it so fondly and so short-sightedly clings is its bane. Like a timid valetudinarian, crouching over the fire, and shrinking from the vigorous buffetings of health-giving breezes, it is perishing through a mischievous system of effeminate coddling. Its existence as an active, growing art-life has gone; its existence as a remunerative industry is rapidly going. Artistically, its utmost achievements consist in a servile copying or an ignominious repetition of a debased past; commercially, its extent is a constantly diminishing quantity. In proof of the first assertion, we have only to refer to the silver work of America and of France, that has so utterly eclipsed the efforts of English competitors at International Exhibitions. In substantiation of the second, the figures which we publish in another column to-day bear emphatic witness. The inference is an uncomfortable one, but it cannot be avoided. The duty on silver, with all its attendant impediments upon the free development of artistic manufacture, is strangling an old home trade, and has so encouraged lethargy, so stamped out enterprise, that we are losing irretrievably our foreign markets. Complacently dwelling under the fatal blight of laws which preclude the sale in this country of foreign-made silver, our manufacturers have had none of the stimulus of competition, and they awake to find the Americans supplying themselves with goods with which, in artistic beauty and even manipulative finish, our own will not bear comparison. At

* "Principles of Political Economy," chap. iv., p. 505.

"home, notwithstanding the increased purchasing power of the country, the sale of silver goods steadily declines. . . . The reasonable plan is to make this industry, like all others, free."

"Its existence as an active, growing art-life has gone ;" how could it have been otherwise ? An art-life, like any other life, must die of inanition. We are not living in Arcadia. Artists themselves are but mortals, and in these degenerate (?) days of high rents, rates, and taxes, they seek remuneration the same as other less favoured mortals.

A visit to South Kensington would at once illustrate the truth of the proposition. Here we find scores of students whose object it is to work their way into the several branches of trade. Doubtless there are many in this hall who are aware of the gigantic work of education now prevailing under the influence of the Science and Art Department.

A glance at the Schools will suffice to show the great preference given by the students to those trades which are hampered by no restrictions, such as carpets, furniture, decoration, curtains, paper-hangings, brasswork, fenders, mechanical engineering—anything, indeed, but to the silver trade ! And why ? Because the silver trade being taxed, and consequently confined within the narrowest possible limits (the whole trade of the United Kingdom not amounting to more than 350,000*l.* a year), offers no temptation to artists to adopt it as a profession. High salaries are inconsistent with small profits. It is not the nature of a declining trade to attract labour or capital to it ; whereas the trades above named not only attract labour and capital to themselves, but offer the very highest rewards to artists of eminence for their successful development.

The same may be said of technical education ; it is manifest that no scheme, however wisely devised, can benefit the silver trade until taxation and the other vexatious hindrances to trade have been abolished. In the first place, for so unremunerative a trade, no one will care to be technically educated. Secondly, inasmuch as every scheme must include theory and practice, it is plain that so long as the tax exists, there must be a serious hindrance to the work of education. So long as a law remains in force that, before an article is put together, almost in its rough state, it must be sent to the Hall and a duty of from 12½ to 20 per cent. be paid upon it, it is useless to talk about technical education for the silversmith. The difficulties are, in point of fact, insurmountable.

Before proceeding further it is desirable that I should trace the origin of the duty upon silver plate.

A tax of sixpence per ounce was first levied in the year 1719.* In 1758 it was repealed, as was then said, "for the encouragement of the trade." It may, therefore, be presumed that the tax had, even in those days, been found to be depressing in its effect. In 1784,† however, the tax was again imposed. In 1797 it was raised to one shilling, in 1804 to fifteenpence, and in 1815‡ it was again raised to eighteenpence an ounce, at which it still remains.

The dates are significant. It is a war tax! This is proved by the history of the National Debt. At the accession of William III. the National Debt amounted to 664,263*l.* sterling, the result of the Revolution of 1689. The debt at the accession of Queen Anne amounted to 16,394,702*l.*; at her death in 1714 it had increased to 54,145,363*l.*

The advisers of George I. recommended the attempt to pay off the National Debt, and between his accession in 1714 and 1727, the date of his death, a sum of 2,058,125*l.* was paid off. Hence the tax upon silver plate, from which, in common with many other articles, it was sought to provide the means of repayment. From A.D. 1727, the date of the accession of George II., until the Peace of Paris in 1763, three years after the date of the accession of George III., a sum of 86,773,192*l.* was added to the National Debt, making the total indebtedness 138,865,480*l.* Between 1763 and 1775, the date of the commencement of the American War, a sum of 10,281,795*l.* was paid off. The American War cost 121,267,993*l.* At its conclusion, in 1784, the debt stood at 249,851,628*l.*, and in the peace which followed, until 1793, a sum of 10,501,380*l.* was paid off. The French War cost 601,500,343*l.*; so that in 1817 the National Debt amounted to 840,850,591*l.* sterling.

At this time, as we all know, protection reigned supreme. The country, alarmed at the consequences of war, and overwhelmed with a sense of the responsibility of debt, sought, by taxing every article of commerce, to provide the means of payment for interest, which at that time amounted to no less a sum than 32,038,191*l.* per annum. This state of things continued, without alteration, until the commencement of the free trade agitation, since when taxes have been abolished in the case of not less than twelve hundred different articles, the tendency of modern legislation being to concentration of duties upon the great articles of every-day consumption—viz., tobacco, spirits, wine, beer, and tea; the principle being that, as traders are relieved from taxation, so in like degree they contribute more and

* To pay for the Spanish War.

† To pay for the American War.

‡ To pay for the French War.

more to the revenue derived from those articles, and to the income-tax.

Hall-marking dates from A.D. 1300, 28 Edward I. c. 20, commonly called "*Articuli super cartas*." It ordained that "none work worse silver than money; that no manner of vessel depart out of the hands of the workers until it be assayed by the wardens of the craft; and further, that it be marked with the *leopard's head*."

In A.D. 1327, 1 Edward III., bearing date the 30th March, the first charter was granted to the Goldsmiths' Company, empowering the Company to punish offenders. The Company's ordinances of 1336 enjoin "that silver work be brought to the Hall to be assayed, and that such as will bear *the touch* shall be marked with the owners' and sayers' marks, and with the *Liberdshede* crowned." The mark of the lion was added about the year 1545. The King's head, the duty mark, was added in 1784, when the duty was re-imposed.

It is commonly, but most erroneously, supposed that the original purpose of hall-marking was, and that its continued purpose is, the protection of the public from fraud. Nothing can be further from the fact. Indirectly, in olden times its effect may have been so; but it cannot be denied that the goldsmiths of the period obtained the hall-mark to protect themselves from competitors beyond the City walls, and that the King granted it to protect himself from the exportation of the then coin of the realm—a capital offence in those days.

There is a famous line in Goethe's "*Faust*"—

"We inherit laws and privileges like an eternal disease,"

and I often think, in pondering on it, that the great German poet, in writing these words, must have had in view, amongst other things, the laws and privileges of our world-famous old Goldsmiths' Company, dwelling in Foster Lane, under the shadow of St. Paul's. So much is certain, that if any one acquainted with the subject were called upon to prove the assertion of Goethe that there are, among civilized nations, laws and privileges which descend, from generation to generation, "like an eternal disease," he could scarcely find a better illustration than that of the wonderful franchises and privileges of the Goldsmiths' Company, dating many centuries back, and apparently immortal.

As is well known, all the City Guilds have their "time-honoured" privileges, derived from former English kings, and paid for in most instances; the sole reason for their being given existing in that our old sovereigns were always terribly in want of some ready cash, which could not be obtained in any other manner. Nearly the whole of these privileges are indefensible, but none more so than those obtained at

various times by the Goldsmiths' Company. It is not in the least an exaggerated mode of expression to characterise them simply as monstrous. Probably no corporation that ever existed managed to wring such extraordinary prerogatives from needy kings, in times of their deepest distress, than the old Goldsmiths of London. And the reason was simple enough. The goldsmiths, many of them from Lombardy and other parts of the Continent, were the earliest professional money-lenders in this country, their trade subsequently developing into banking. Whenever a king wanted any considerable sum of money, he had to go to the goldsmiths, there being no other body of individuals whatever able to raise an amount with which a foreign war could be carried on, or even an insurrection at home be suppressed. The goldsmiths, consequently, being monopolists in the money-lending business, charged high for their services, taking handsome bonuses besides, in the shape of charters granting them astounding privileges. There is no wonder that the charters, giving the keen money-lenders all that they asked for, were given; but the wonder of wonders is that these charters should be claimed as valid at the present day. It is true, some of the privileges extracted by the clever money-lending goldsmiths from insolvent kings have been tacitly given up, being too preposterous for assertion, but those that are still claimed are only a shade less absurd. At the head of them stands the grand and quite unique prerogative of the London Goldsmiths' Company, enjoyed, for a long time, as an absolute monopoly—though now shared by recent legislation, with other “Goldsmiths' Halls” established at Edinburgh, Dublin, Birmingham, Chester, Exeter, Newcastle, and Sheffield—for the assay of all gold and silver ware manufactured in this country.

I will now briefly describe the law as it stands at the present time. All silver plate exposed for sale in the United Kingdom must be hall-marked, and it must be of the ordained standard of 11 oz. 2 dwt. of fine silver to the pound, troy. Plate is sent to the various assay offices in the rough. It is there scraped, and the scrapings are submitted to the process of the “parting” assay. Should the goods stand the required test, the hall-marks—four in number, exclusive of the maker's mark—are applied, and, in addition to a small charge for marking, a duty of 1s. 6d. an ounce is payable.

From the duty, a rebate of 3d. per ounce is allowed to cover a supposed loss in polishing and finishing. I shall refer to this matter hereafter. Should the goods or a single article comprised in a parcel, large or small, sent to the Hall, not stand the required test, the whole parcel is broken up and returned to the manufacturer.

Not long ago, a silversmith sent a parcel of goods to Goldsmiths' Hall, comprising, among other articles, a small cream jug; either by accident or malice on the part of a workman, something was wrong with the milk-jug; the whole parcel was destroyed, involving a loss of some 24*l.* of workmen's wages. Goods are sent to the Hall before nine o'clock A.M., and are fetched at five o'clock P.M. Sometimes manufacturers are told that the goods are "in doubt;" they are then retained until the following day, when they are returned marked or broken up, as the case may be. There is no appeal. If returned duly marked, the goods go back into the workshop, and some time is spent in restoring them from the time-honoured effects of the scrape, which, as may be surmised, leaves its own mark behind it.

I have already referred to the duty, 1*s.* 6*d.* per ounce, and to the rebate. This was allowed about the year 1820, upon the representation of the trade that it was unfair that they should pay a duty upon the gross weight prior to finishing. They obtained a reduction of one-sixth. But this led at once to an improvement of their dies, and to the more careful preparation of their goods for hall-marking, which resulted in their getting a profit upon the duty itself. The largest manufacturer in London raised an objection to the proposal to abolish the taxation of silver plate, on the ground that he worked up 120,000 ounces every year, and that he obtained 2*d.* profit upon every ounce, or 1,000*l.* per annum on the duty alone, inasmuch as he found that the loss in finishing did not exceed 1*d.* per ounce!

It was also acknowledged by an eminent authority in the trade, in his evidence before the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Hall-marking (1878), that a profit is derived from the duty. It need scarcely be said that this amounts to "a bounty," especially upon exported plate, as the entire duty is then recoverable. There is, therefore, a bounty on the export of silver plate; whereas, as will presently be shown, the import of foreign silver plate is practically prohibited.

Foreign silver plate is admitted into this country upon payment of duty. But it cannot be exposed for sale unless hall-marked at one of the various assay offices, under a penalty of a fine of 10*l.* for each piece so exposed, and confiscation. There is a curious anomaly to be observed. The Government take the duty, and then forbid the goods being dealt in, excepting under such conditions as amount to a virtual prohibition. They must be "scraped and assayed." In other words, they — frequently highly finished and artistic articles — must go through a process which, in any case, necessitates their return to the workshop, and in most instances injures them past hope of recovery.

This, I apprehend, is the question of interest this evening. It must seem to be a curiously impolitic law which forbids the subjects of the same dynasty to deal with one another in the case of one, and only one, article of manufacture. The inconsistency is apparent. At a time when the price of silver, and, as a consequence, the value of the Indian rupee, is depreciated, it is manifestly the interest of the Government, as it is of the people, that the consumption of silver for manufacturing purposes should be encouraged—not, as now, discouraged—in every possible way.

Far be it from me to plead that taking off the tax from silver plate and relaxing the laws relating to hall-marking would affect the value of silver in any great degree; but I do maintain that it might have some small effect, and that it is impossible to foresee what the effect might eventually be. There must be, there is, a limit to a hampered and hindered industry; under conditions of freedom, there is but the natural limit under the economic principle of supply and demand. It is not unreasonable to argue that there is no limit, inasmuch as one trade leads to, and plays into the hands of, another. For example, if the silver trade were free, it might be greatly assisted by the furniture trade, as is the case in India, chairs and other “household gods” being heavily ornamented with silver. At the present time, if a furniture manufacturer were to ornament a chair with silver, the Goldsmiths’ Company and the Excise officers would pounce upon him at once, for hall-marking, the duty, and a licence!

We will now consider the objections raised by the trade against any alteration of the law. The first objection is that the duty is not “protective,” inasmuch as the Customs’ and Excise duties are levied *pari passu*; therefore, foreigners have nothing to complain about. Secondly, that it would be unfair to holders of stocks, and indeed to the general possessors of silver goods, to take off the tax without granting a drawback. Thirdly, that the duty, equally with the hall-mark, is a protection to the public, as, were there no duty, hall-marking, not being directly under Government control, would become obsolete, and then all sorts of terrible things would happen. Foreigners—including, of course, Indians—would import “rubbish,” the public would be defrauded, and, most terrible of events, the trade would be ruined. It need scarcely be said that these are simply the arguments of protectionists. The terrible event which would happen is that manufacturers would be exposed to foreign competition, and that small capitalists would embark in the trade.

With regard to the question of a drawback, it is difficult to see how the Government could provide for its payment, even if the principle

were conceded, and funds were forthcoming; but a tax must not be allowed to prevail everlastingly because traders hold duty-paid stocks. Other traders have had to meet such a loss, notably the timber trade.

It may be remarked that there is no precedent of a trade from which taxation has been abolished petitioning the Government in favour of its re-imposition.

But there remain the public. Their case is best described in the words of John Stuart Mill. "Trade," he exclaims, in his *Essay on Freedom*, "is a social act. Whoever undertakes to sell any description of goods to the public does what affects the interests of other persons, and of society in general, and thus his conduct in principle comes within the jurisdiction of society; accordingly, it was once held to be the duty of Governments, in all cases which were considered of importance, to fix prices and regulate the processes of manufacture. But it is now recognized, though not till after a long struggle, that both the cheapness and good quality of commodities are most effectually provided for by leaving the producers and sellers perfectly free under the sole check of equal freedom to the buyers for supplying themselves elsewhere."

This, I maintain, should be the guiding principle of all trades, save only those—like food, poisons, and explosives—which seriously affect the well-being of society. That ruin to any trade accompanies freedom from legislative control is a proposition which may be dismissed as idle; and that "compulsory" hall-marking is a protection to the public in these days, amidst a population of 84,000,000, is clearly disproved by the fact that "forgery" and "transferring" of hall-marks are crimes which our law courts are finding to be common, but usually unpunishable, offences. Nothing is more certain than that wherever there may be an exciseman, there will be found his shadow—the smuggler.

To conclude. The duties upon gold and silver plate, together producing only 50,000*l.* per annum to the Exchequer, should be abolished with as little delay as possible, in conformity with the recommendation of the Select Committee on Hall-marking (1879). The question of hall-marking deserves consideration. It is certain that the public attach importance to the hall-mark. A great part of the trade share this conviction. A minority of the trade attach no importance whatever to it, preferring the more modern system of a trade-mark as a guarantee of their wares. Without doubt, a desire for the continuation of protection is the chief consideration of most manufacturers. Of course, this principle is disclaimed; for where, in these times, is the

protectionist who will frankly own that he wants protection? "He," as a writer in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, on the 10th November, in an article entitled "Fair Trade in Watches," says, "wants something" which perverse opponents will persist in calling protection. As regards both the watch and silver trades, what they stand in need of is freedom, not protection. Hall-marking has its value, but it is obviously a regulation in restraint of trade. There is a strong feeling in its favour among certain manufacturers, and there is no reason why it should not be gratified; but there is equally good reason why the hall-mark should not continue to be compulsory, either for plate or watches. It is a relic of public functions which, in far different times, embraced all kinds of industry, and which only a superstitious regard for the 'precious metals' has preserved in its now limited sphere of operation."

This I believe to be the solution of the difficulty. Hall-marking of gold and silver plate should, as now prevails in the case of gold and silver jewelry, be a voluntary institution; foreign plate (like foreign jewelry) being admitted free from any legislative interference. It will be manifest to every one in this room, with any knowledge of the beautiful work of India and America, and of its quality as respects the material, that the English public will not be much injured by its introduction for marketable purposes into this country; and as respects the manufacturers and dealers, wholesome competition, under conditions of freedom, enabling him to hall-mark his wares or not, as he may think proper, should—and, in the opinion of the writer of this paper, assuredly will—lead to a revival of one of the most ancient, as it is one of the most beautiful, of British industries; while, at the same time, it will develop a trade with India which should become of much importance to the people of both countries.

The CHAIRMAN then intimated that the discussion was open to be continued by any gentleman present, the only proviso of the East India Association on occasions like these being that, in the general interest, speeches must not extend beyond ten minutes each. Prior to the opening of the discussion, and while any intending speakers were reviewing their thoughts on the subject, he thought it would be well to read a letter which was placed into his hands on entering the room. It was from Sir George Birdwood, who found that he could not attend the meeting as he originally designed. He said, "All old Indians interested in the welfare of the country which has provided for them in life, should be grateful to Mr. Watherston for the thoroughly informed and energetic agitation he has been carrying on

“ for years against the duties on plate. They are absolutely prohibi-
 “ tive of the importation of Indian gold plate into this country, the
 “ duty on gold being 17s. per ounce. The duty on silver is only 1s. 6d.
 “ an ounce, but how unjust this is to India will be understood by all
 “ when it is remembered that the cost of ordinary silver plate in
 “ India is at the rate of only 1s. 3d. per ounce for the labour ex-
 “ pended on it. But on the point of the plate duty I need say no
 “ more, as—and that very much owing to Mr. Watherston’s efforts—
 “ it is doomed. There can be no doubt that on the first opportunity
 “ it will be abolished at one stroke. On the other hand, I am alto-
 “ gether opposed to the abolition of hall marking, and I have never
 “ been able to understand the objections to it. It is very necessary
 “ for the protection of the public, almost helpless in such a matter
 “ to protect itself; and I have never known it inflict any injury.
 “ The scrapings for trial never exceed eight grains troy. The practice
 “ is five hundred years old, and it has served under every trial to
 “ conserve a natural style in English plate; while it is entirely owing
 “ to its virtual abolition for articles of personal ornament that England
 “ no longer possesses a national style in jewelry, such as we still
 “ find in Flanders, France, and Germany. At such Continental fairs
 “ as that held at Boulogne-sur-Mer every August one may buy up in
 “ pinchbeck and imitation gems the loveliest forms of the peasant
 “ jewelry of Picardy, Normandy, Brittany, Gascony, Languedoc,
 “ Alsace, Lorraine, and Flanders, in which one recognizes at a
 “ glance the traditional sources of the personal ornament represented
 “ on the canvas of Holbein, the Van Eycks, and other ancient masters.
 “ The neglect of hall marking has destroyed all this in England, and
 “ spoilt our foreign trade in jewelry. It is only necessary to compare
 “ the excess of the Paris manufacture of jewelry over that of London,
 “ While the former city finds a ready market for its jewelry all over the
 “ world, the productions of the latter are almost unknown beyond the
 “ mother country and her colonies. Yet some of the noblest jewelry
 “ of our time is the manufacture of Londoners. Our goods are despised
 “ by foreigners, no matter how intrinsically pure they are, and how
 “ artistically good, because they bear no mark guaranteeing the title
 “ of the gold worked up in them. They are condemned therefore out
 “ of hand as ‘*or Anglais*.’ ‘It may be accepted as an axiom,’ observes
 “ the late Mr. Robert Phillips, the most learned authority on art
 “ jewelry of the present century in England, ‘that where there is no con-
 “ trol mark (hall marking) there is no confidence.’ So far, indeed, from
 “ abolishing hall marking, I would make it illegal to manufacture or
 “ sell in Great Britain any article whatsoever in gold or silver without

“ the mark of the Goldsmiths’ Company, and representing a title of
 “ not less than 18 carats ; and I would gladly make it hanging for
 “ any manufacturer who evaded or forged the hall marking. I do not
 “ understand how Mr. Watherston, who is himself a classical goldsmith,
 “ is not like-minded on the subject. As regards India the Government
 “ could confer no greater boon on the unapproachable goldsmiths and
 “ jewellers of the country than making it compulsory for them to have
 “ stamped at the State mints every article made by them for exporta-
 “ tion from Calcutta, Madras, or Bombay.”

Mr. R. M. HOLBORN said that the meeting had enjoyed a great treat, as the able and accomplished essayist had clothed his arguments with elegance at every step ; but he would still excuse him for remarking that he had not adhered strictly to the announcement made as to the subject for that evening. The text was “ Indian Productions in Silver, and why they are virtually Prohibited from Importation.” Now, the bulk of the most interesting address they had heard had been devoted to a claim for the removal of the duty on the home-manufactured silver. The case had thus been presented to the audience on the part of the vendors and manufacturers, and perhaps it would not be presumptuous for him (the speaker) to put it on behalf of the buyer. While he did this, he might say that he entertained the highest respect for Mr. Watherston for the energy and enterprise and thoroughly British determination which he had for so many years displayed in connection with this subject. With many of the views enunciated by the lecturer it was impossible to disagree. Take his main argument, for instance, as to the tax on the manufacture ; it was a truism that a tax on any manufacture restricts the production, and this might be proved on a large scale by citing the articles of consumption—tea and sugar. When a duty of 3d. per lb. was on sugar, moist sugar cost 9d. per lb., and loaf 1s., whereas now the entire cost to the consumer was little more than the duty used to be. With tea a similar result had been produced by the reduction of the duty. He asked, Would Mr. Watherston give a promise that the public would receive a similar benefit in regard to silver ? He took leave to doubt it. He was able to testify to the results which had followed the relief from duty in the articles he had mentioned, because he was a member of a firm paying about 66,000*l.* a year, or more than 200*l.* per working day for duty on tea. Turning, however, to the question of the evening, he might say that he had arrived at the following conclusions : First, that the evil is *not*, in the words of the essayist, “ from unjust laws,” but from very shocking maladministration of the laws ; second,

from an utter indifference on the part of the trade, alike to the artistic productions, to the maladministration, and to every absurd bogey set up by arrogance, ignorance, and obstinacy; third, to the gross perversity of those on this side to whom, from time to time, experimental consignments of the most beautiful products of Indian silver ware are made; fourth, as evil as any of the foregoing, to the obstructive and destructive red-tape conflict between the administrators of law, represented by the Customs on one side, and the Excise, or Goldsmiths' Hall authorities, on the other. The fifth clause of the indictment was the ignorance in which the artists in India are kept as to the exact requirements of the law in the mother country as to the degree of fineness of *every bit* of each article, or they would never debar such work as stood on the table (some specimens exhibited by the speaker) from the Hall by a casual deficiency of fineness of 2 or 3 per cent.; the law requires 11 oz. 2 dwt. of pure fine silver to the 12 oz. (1 lb.) troy, and by a deficiency of 3 per cent. upon this standard, the Cashmere and Cutch makers sacrifice 40 per cent. in the British value of their silver manufactures; this native ignorance being, however, chargeable under clause 3 of this indictment—viz., to the neglect of those on this side to inform [this was uttered more specifically] Indian producers. With regard to the obstacle in the way from the Customs, he (Mr. Holborn) had recently had experience. Only the previous week duty was paid on 337 ounces of silver work, and the Customs refused to sign a certificate that they had received the duty. Without some certificate, the Excise at Goldsmiths' Hall would be unable to identify the articles as having paid the duty. The effect of this was that, there being no certificate, the authorities at Goldsmiths' Hall would say, "You must pay the 1s. 6d. per ounce *to us*," and so, between the Customs and the Excise, the unfortunate owner stands to pay 3s. per ounce instead of 1s. 6d. He (Mr. Holborn) denounced this as a tyrannical maladministration of the laws, and here produced and handed round some printed copies of the certificate for receipt of duty, which the Customs had refused to sign, saying that the case was made much worse by the fact that the Customs do give certificates on meaner goods. He had been referring to "Little Dorrit," written twenty-five years ago, and containing "the whole science of government." Charles Dickens only faintly coloured matters in his description of "The Circumlocution Office." Alluding to the specimens on the table, imported from Cashmere, the speaker said that thirty-three lots of them had been offered twice or thrice at public auction, and duly advertised, and yet when the day of sale came there was not a jeweller

or a silversmith in the room. He happened to be engaged by Dr. Watts's universal employer of "idle hands," who tempted him to buy seven lots of the silver and a few of the gold. The most choice specimens had wandered away among his children and grandchildren, but before this, he took the whole of his purchase with him to Sheffield on the occasion of the Cutlers' Feast, to which he received an invitation from an old friend, the present Master Cutler, who was not what might be termed "a mere plater," but a most enterprising silversmith, with the quickest eye for a good mould or a good form that he (the speaker) ever knew of; but the Master Cutler and his eminent compeers shunned the Samaritan and the uncircumcized, and the greater part of the London leaders did the same. But this was the mildest part of the story. He held in his hand a catalogue of the 12th of December, of 810 ounces, in twenty-two lots, of the most elegant *repoussée* work which he had ever seen, which was offered by those old East India merchants, Messrs. Forbes, Forbes and Co. Yet there was not a single shabby bid for the work except his (the speaker's) own. The specimens on the table were mere toy work compared with this choice *hand-hammered* work; every scrap of it was raised designs and ornaments, beaten out by the most delicate tools. There it was, unsold, in the London and St. Katharine Docks warehouse in Bishopsgate, and he should be happy to take anyone interested to see it. The merchants were so hampered with the Customs and Excise authorities and their obstacles, that the brokers had written to him, saying that they felt they would do the greater justice to the makers, our fellow-subjects in India, by returning their beautiful work and the result of their enterprise, as the difficulties in the way of disposing of it were insurmountable. In concluding, Mr. Holborn said that the irritation against the Customs authorities was very great, and when it was suggested to petition the Honourable Commissions, experience taught that, while those who sat spelt it b-o-a-r-d, those who applied found it b-o-r-e-d. (Laughter.)

Mr. JAMES U. POOLE wished to remind the meeting that there was nothing to prevent wealthy buyers from purchasing silver art work in any country where it is produced, and having it delivered here, except that the duty must be paid, and that the goods cannot be resold without marking. Take the case of a nobleman wishing to spend several thousand pounds in silver plate. He can get designs from Tiffany, of New York, or anywhere else, and having made his selection, he can obtain delivery of his plate on paying the import duty of 1s. 6d. per ounce, and he can take his purchase into his own mansion and use it.

Mr. FARRER: Could he send it to Christie's when he has done with it? (A laugh.)

Mr. JAMES U. POOLE: By getting it hall marked here, or it might be re-shipped to America and sold to equal advantage there. The speaker went on to say that some time ago he delivered a lecture on hall marking before the British Horological Institute, in the course of which he had touched upon one of the principal reasons urged in favour of the free introduction of foreign plate—to wit, that “English plate is so ugly,” and that the public are “prevented from obtaining “artistic designs.” It was recently said in the *Saturday Review* that a “lump of silver in the rough is preferable to a modern race-cup or centrepiece.” To this he thought his best answer would be to quote a sentence from a leading article in the *Graphic*, referring to the erection of Temple Bar:—“When we read, therefore, in a leading article in “one of our contemporaries, that the monument is an ugly German “stove, capped by a ridiculous brazen guy, we feel that, for the sake of “saying something smart, the ingenious writer is indulging in un-“warrantable exaggeration.” It is, of course, perfectly well known that there is a strong tendency for manufacturers in all trades to run in “ruts”; but, taking into consideration the facilities which art students enjoy in this country, it is impossible that the statements above quoted can be credited. The Gorham Silver Plate Manufacturing Company say America has no such magnificent schools of art as the South Kensington Museum, and the lack of suitable museums has been keenly felt. The South Kensington Museum authorities send experts on European tours for the express purpose of making arrangements to obtain copies of works of art abroad; and the Goldsmiths' Company, whose especial business it is to foster the trade, annually offer prizes for design and workmanship. Manufacturers are, moreover, continually kept up to the mark by the more enterprising shopkeepers, who select from competing designs. He knew that such designs were frequently obtained from Paris, or other foreign schools, and manufacturers were compelled to reproduce those designs. It was therefore, he thought, unfair to accuse the silver trade of being behindhand. Another point he wished to bring before the meeting was the fact that the great majority of the trade were strongly opposed to Mr. Watherston's views on the whole subject. (Hear, hear.) They are opposed to the entire removal of the silver duty and to the abolition of hall marking. And if that be true of the manufacturers, it is true also of the artisans. (Hear, hear.) He had attended the meeting of the workmen of the trade at Foresters' Hall early last year, when they

determined to petition Mr. Gladstone to abandon his intention to gradually abolish the duty; and either to allow a drawback on existing stocks, and take the duty off at once, or else to leave the thing alone. (Hear, hear.) All were agreed in keeping the hall marking. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Gladstone saw a deputation and listened to an explanation of their views; and at a subsequent special meeting of the trade at Goldsmiths' Hall a resolution was agreed to, expressing confidence in the working of the present system, and a hope that it would never be altered. While entertaining the most profound personal respect for Mr. Watherston, he thought the fact that the lecturer was entirely out of accord with the rest of the trade had not been mentioned so prominently as its significance demanded.

Mr. W. CARLTON WOOD said he wished to offer a few words with reference to the effect of the abolition of the hall marking on the trade of India, and its connection with this country. He believed that it was universally admitted that India and other countries produce silver goods after a style of manufacture different to what we do in this country, and the reason why these goods were not to be purchased in this country was the stipulation about hall marking of silver, combined with the duty. It was perfectly true that any gentleman could order 1,000*l.* worth if he chose, and get it into his possession simply on payment of the duty. But he could not sell it, nor could anyone deal in it, so that it would be evident that trade under such restrictions must be very limited. He (the speaker) had the honour to be connected with a firm in India which was largely interested in the general welfare and trade of India—not merely the silver trade; and the result of his experience went to show that anything that induced and encouraged trade between India and England was of mutual advantage. He therefore submitted that what the lecturer had said about the way in which trade would be opened up was quite correct; and, further, remembering the balance of exchange grievance, everything or anything that tended to right that must be of advantage to both countries. (Hear, hear.) He consequently contended that the abolition of the duty and the hall marking—for the abolition of the duty with the continuance of the present regulations at Goldsmiths' Hall would be useless—would have very great results in the direction of increasing trade. It would be useless to remove the duty and allow the hall marking to continue, for articles by that process would be so damaged that, as works of art, they would be spoiled and rendered unsaleable. (Hear, hear.)

If they were patched up after marking they would still have lost their value as works of art. What was required, then, was the abolition of the duty and the discontinuance of the existing system of hall marking. If that were done it would be impossible to estimate the trade that would be produced, for the impetus given to it would be marvellous. He held that such trade would be advantageous to this country as well as to India, for the dealings, not only in silver, but in silver ornamented articles, would be very largely increased.

Mr. W. MARTIN WOOD said he had no intention of dilating upon the interesting subject which had been raised in Mr. Watherston's excellent paper. To have covered the whole field he thought its title should have run, "Indian and other Foreign Productions in Gold and Silver;" for Mr. Watherston was doubtless well aware that gold plate is also severely excluded by the operation of the duty—so severely as to make Indian gold plate a rarity in this country outside the museums. Persons requiring specimens of the work of the goldsmiths of Cashmere, Kutch, or Delhi, must pay a duty of 17s. per ounce; and this made its importation in the way of mercantile business prohibitory. The last speaker had protested that it was very difficult to believe that the trade in Indian and other foreign plate would increase with the abolition of the duty. Well, perhaps, in a case like this the result must be largely a matter of inference; but for his part he believed that a good deal could be made out for the probable success of a free-trade policy by reference to the figures of the trade returns of India. He found that in the year ending March, 1880, the total value of the plate exported from India, including gold, was 26,000 rupees, manifestly an absurd amount in proportion to what could be produced were there no unnatural obstacles in the way. In the same period earthenware and porcelain—in which articles India has no specialty—of the value of 30,000 rupees were exported, and even such unimportant articles as boots and shoes to the value of 54,000 rupees; feathers, two and three quarter lakhs; jewelry, including pearls and precious stones, three lakhs' worth. It seemed an obvious inference that these miserably small figures of the exports of Indian gold and silver plate would be greatly enlarged were the hindrances swept away from its access to this, the best market in Europe. (Hear, hear.) Indian plate is manufactured, he would venture to remind the meeting, not only in Cashmere, but largely in Kutch, in Trichinopoly and elsewhere, as Mr. Watherston and the other speakers showed. It had been argued that there could not be much impediment in the production of silver work when any private

buyer can import as much as he likes. But those who said that must be aware that such a system was by no means equivalent to a free and open mercantile trade. (Hear, hear.) He need not remind the right honourable Chairman that amongst many other social and industrial questions which came before him during that anxious but interesting portion of his public career, when he formed a portion of the Executive Government of India, was, and is, for all succeeding Indian statesmen, how to evoke and make prosperous other industries than those dependent upon the tillage of the land. Those who knew India were well aware that the encouragement and promotion of industrial arts and the stimulation of manufacturing occupations were of the first necessity, in order to relieve the great pressure upon the land and agriculture. It is a well-known maxim amongst statist and political economists that unless there are manufacturing industries existing concurrently with agriculture, and in due proportion, the nation will be stagnant, and every community backward in the race. The specimens exhibited by Mr. Watherston and Mr. Holborn abundantly proved that India was quite prepared to take her place as a producer of art work if she were only allowed a fair chance; and they were sufficient to dispose every fair-minded man to urge the removal of a duty which was a burden to both home and foreign trade, and which produced, after all, such a miserable amount of revenue. He trusted that the result of Mr. Watherston's efforts, which he was sure would be warmly supported in India, would be the repeal of the duty, perhaps in the forthcoming Budget. To this end he ventured to propose the following resolution, which he concluded by formally moving:—

Resolved, "That the Council of the East India Association be empowered, and is requested to apply to the proper authorities by petition, or memorial supported by deputation, urging that the import duty on gold and silver plate be abolished, and that hall marking be no longer compulsory."

The CHAIRMAN said that this resolution might be considered at the termination of the discussion on Mr. Watherston's paper.

Mr. CHARLES W. McMINN remarked that if the duty were taken off silver there could be no doubt whatever that the manufacture of plate in India would be largely developed, and a considerable amount of the same regularly imported into this country. But the gentleman who had read a most instructive essay on the subject had not taken into account the rate at which plate could be manufactured in India, and perhaps he was not aware of the cheap rate at which the

articles exhibited in the room (by Mr. Holborn) could be made in Cashmere. Those interesting and exquisite specimens of art, which had been so highly praised, could be made at a cost equal to about twopence in the shilling's worth of raw material. It was clear that, if articles that could be manufactured thus cheaply were freely admitted to England, the result would be that the learned essayist would, with his colleagues in trade, be seriously injured, and his trade might possibly go the wall. They could not expect an English artisan to work for the same wages as the Indian artisan. An Indian would labour the whole of the day, and perhaps part of the night, for threepence or fourpence; he requires no clothes, no fuel, nothing but a little rice. If, therefore, the production was stimulated, and there were large importations of plate or jewelry into England, English manufactures must inevitably suffer. The whole question was thus surrounded by difficulties. He had considered it from several points of view. No doubt the East India Association, looking after the interests of India, would desire that there should be a mart for the silver productions of that country, but there was another point of view which was to be considered in London, and that was, Would it be wise to abolish this tax altogether? He himself had no opinion to offer, but he could not but think that a vote should not be taken on the subject without reference to the circumstance that this duty is a sumptuary tax, almost the last of that class of taxes which gave evidence of the wise desire that obtained in former times, that the wealthier classes should bear their share of the taxation. We should not be in a hurry to remove these sumptuary taxes, which were imposed by some of the wisest and greatest monarchs England ever had. When it was remembered that Edward I. and Edward III. passed these laws, we should also reflect on the circumstance that those were the most glorious times of English history. Classes were then bound together by ties, unhappily no longer existent; and the men who made these laws and were governed by them, it should be borne in mind, were the men who won Cressy and Poitiers, while the men of these later days were the men who lost Maiwand and Isandula. (Oh!)

Mr. T. H. THORNTON, C.S.I., said he would venture to add to the arguments which had been so ably urged by Mr. Watherston and other speakers in support of the abolition of the taxation upon silver plate, another argument which, as an old Indian official, he thought deserving of consideration. He thought the abolition of the duty might be claimed not only on grounds of enlightened fiscal policy, or

as a means of promoting improved technical education in a branch of artistic industry, but also as a measure of propriety and just dealing in relation to the people of India. (Hear, hear.) England, or perhaps he should more properly say England as represented by Manchester, was for ever preaching to India the paramount duty of adopting in regard to manufactures a free-trade policy; and on this pretext was continually putting pressure upon the Indian Government to abolish the exceedingly moderate import duty which is now laid upon English piece goods of the finer qualities. He was not going to enter into the vexed question of these duties, but he would venture to say this—that if England is to assume the rôle of a lecturer upon the whole duty of free trade, it was only right, it was only reasonable, to expect that she should practise what she preaches. (Hear, hear.) But does England in this case practise what she preaches? (No.) He thought that all who were present would agree with him that she certainly does not; for, whereas in the case of the English piece goods she denounces India for levying a 5 per cent. *ad valorem* duty, and grudges her the revenue from it, which India can ill afford to lose, she herself is all the time levying upon a product of Indian industry—silver work—a duty equivalent to 33 per cent. *ad valorem*! (Hear, hear.) He was aware that there is a stock argument against this representation. It was urged that the two cases are not parallel; that, whereas in the case of the import duties on English piece goods the result is protection in favour of the Indian manufacturer, the import duty on silver plate does not operate protectively in favour of the British silver-worker, because the import duty is levied *pari passu* with an Excise duty of the same amount. (Hear, hear.) Assuming this to be the case, it does not deprive the duty of the character of being protective. For though it may not be protective of an industry, it is protective of something that is far less in need of protection—protective of what Mr. Watherston called the “monstrous” privileges of an exceedingly wealthy English Company. He had assumed above that as the import duty and the Excise duty are levied *pari passu*, the duties are protective; but, as a matter of fact, he thought Mr. Watherston proved most completely that the duty practically operates as a protection of the English against the foreign silver-worker, for in the case of the home manufacturer a rebate of 3d. an ounce is allowed to cover a supposed loss in polishing or finishing; but as this supposed loss only amounts to 1d. an ounce, the home manufacturer practically obtains a remission of 10 per cent. of the Excise duty. Again, as the law stands, the importer of Indian silver plate is not only subjected to an impost of 33 per cent., but if he wishes to sell he must

submit each article to the process of hall marking, with all its attendant inconveniences and risks, which are far greater in the case of imported silver plate than in the case of the home-manufactured article. In fact, the hall-marking process, as applied to foreign silver plate, frequently, according to Mr. Watherston, injures the workmanship past hope of recovery. (Hear, hear.) Another argument is used—that there are practical difficulties in the way of taking off this duty from the existence of an unknown quantity of duty-paid stocks, &c., &c. In regard to this he would only say that if the present Prime Minister cannot see his way out of these supposed difficulties—if he cannot see his way to get rid of an exceedingly insignificant import duty (insignificant in its yield to the National Treasury, but exceedingly oppressive in its effects), then he is not possessed of the ingenuity with which all the world believes him to be endowed. (“Hear, hear,” and a laugh.)

Mr. T. H. FARRER (Permanent Secretary of the Board of Trade) said he had a few words to offer. As a permanent official perhaps he should say nothing; but what he had to say, and what he should state to the meeting in the way of opinion on the subject of duty and hall marking he had already stated before a Committee of the House of Commons. Referring to the letter which the Chairman had read from Sir George Birdwood, he was induced to say that he thought Indian officials were so passionately imbued with a love of official government that they could see no good outside it. Sir George Birdwood seemed to think that everything that was good in gold and silver had been produced and distinguished by the system of official marking. His (the speaker's) opinion and experience differed from this view. English silver plate, it was true, was officially marked, but he contended that it was not distinguished for its artistic merit. His own experience he would give as an instance. If there was anything which offered an opportunity to silversmiths, it was the innumerable cups given as prizes. And yet what could be more monstrous and unmeaning than these cups? He had the fortune or misfortune to have a bailiff who could grow some especially good mangolds, for which he (Mr. Farrer) had obtained several prizes in the shape of cups. These had all been of one pattern, like the old sacramental cups, with something, probably a turnip, engraved on one side, and a radish on the other. (Laughter.) He was so tired of the style of the cups that he had asked his friends at Guildford not to give him any more cups, but rather to give him spoons, or forks, or money, if he had to receive a prize. He had rather not have the cups, at any

rate. Then, again, another little experience he had. Speaking as an official, he said that there were some people to whom they—the Board of Trade—gave presents in consideration of services rendered. There was one man, a Frenchman, who had assisted them in making a code of signals, and he desired to have a tea-service of English make. He (the speaker) asked an artistic friend to help him, and they went all over London to find a handsome tea-service, and inspected nearly all the chief silversmiths' shops. He found some excellent old services of the Queen Anne and George III. type, but these were not what the Frenchman wanted; he desired to get something of modern English manufacture in silver. Well, at last they lighted upon something that his friend and he thought good, but it proved, on inquiry, to be the manufacture of Christophle, of Paris. That would not do, and in the end they had to fall back on the repetition of an old Queen Anne service. The result of his experience of thirty years at the Board of Trade had been to show that the best thing the Government could do for any trade or manufacture was to leave it alone, whether the trade was in gold or silver or anything else. Why people should not have mixtures of metals, if they liked, he could not see. It was but the following up of the superstitions of old days concerning the sacredness of the metals used in coinage which kept up compulsory hall marking. His belief was that people would get better silver and better designs if the manufacturers were put on their metal by the removal of the restrictions which, up till now, had surrounded their trade; and if all silver wares, whether made at home or in India or elsewhere, were admitted freely to the market without duty and without any compulsory test or official brand.

The CHAIRMAN, in rising to close the debate, said that he did so only in deference to the custom that exacts a speech from the chairman. It was generally considered that the mere fact of a man sitting in the chair imbues him with a knowledge of the subject, and that it would be necessary for him to say something. Nothing could be stronger evidence of this than Mr. Watherston's challenge in the course of his speech, when he defied "even the chairman himself" to say which of the forks he had in his hand were electro and which silver. He might just as well have defied the chairman to walk the tightrope. (Laughter.) He was told that when Mr. William Sikes gets into one's house, he is clever enough to make the required selection—he leaves the electro plate and takes the silver. If, however, he (the Chairman) got among Mr. Watherston's treasures, he feared that he would be just as likely as not to take the electro and leave the

silver; so little could he distinguish between them. There was one point of the subject, notwithstanding, of which he had some knowledge, and that was the side which was connected with his residence in India; the side, too, which led to the delivery of this lecture in connection with the East India Association. He was always struck with the extreme artistic beauty of Indian manufactures in silver and other metals, and similarly struck with the great ignorance which prevailed even in India with regard to the productions of various parts of the country. From Cuttack he had seen beautiful filagree work equal to that of Genoa. The Cashmere work was before their eyes. From Bhooj there comes as finely embossed and chased work as he had ever seen. In Trinchinopoly there is made exceedingly ingenious and solid silver work, with ornaments of a grotesque character, generally representing Indian gods. In Delhi was to be found the most elegant handwork in imitation of natural objects; particularly the acacia blossom which was imitated in a very beautiful and accurate fashion. These works, beautiful as they are, are hardly known beyond the provinces in which they are produced. A Cuttack man knows nothing about Bhooj work; a Trichinopoly man knows nothing about Cashmere work, and perhaps the native of one place never has seen the work common to another place. Under our rule in India there are, however, increasing opportunities for all these manufactures to find their way into the markets of the world if only greater liberty is given to them, and a free channel cut for them. He (Sir Arthur Hobhouse) was very much struck, the last year he was in India, with the following circumstance: The City of Benares is famous not only for its sacred character and for its school of law, but for a very beautiful manufacture of brass. In the winter of 1876 he got a quantity of this brass work and took it to Calcutta, and while it was lying on the table an Indian gentleman, an eminent lawyer, who held a high position under Government, and was a man of good education and great intelligence, admired this brass, and asked where it came from. He (the Chairman) was surprised to find that this Native gentleman had not seen a specimen before, and really did not know even that such a manufacture was going on in Benares. Now, Benares had been under the same dynasty as Calcutta for upwards of a century; it is in the same valley as Calcutta, and there is river communication between the two places, and yet that Benares work never found its way down to Calcutta. That illustrated the difficulty that Indian manufacturers have had in getting from point to point. Now, we have made a railway, and consequently goods find their way to Calcutta, and from Calcutta to England and London; and now Benares brass work may

be seen in the shop-windows of the metropolis. The same thing might happen with silver; and he quite agreed that it would be a great thing if a market for Indian silver could be found in England; it might have some effect on the glut of silver in India and its consequent depreciation. He should, therefore, be extremely glad if a free channel could be cut for the transition of this manufacture from India to England. Another point was suggested by Mr. Watherston's lecture, and that was the connection between war and taxation. Like Charles the First's head in the case of Mr. Dick, that was always in his (the Chairman's) mind. Mr. Watherston had shown them that the tax on silver was originally imposed because of a war, then repealed during peace, and again imposed because of a war, and finally augmented because of a war. There were three wars: the war about the Spanish succession, the American war, and the great Continental war. These were three wars into which we went quite needlessly. What had been the result? Every one of them had failed in its object, and the loss of the object did us no harm though the war did us harm. The Spanish war was undertaken to keep a Bourbon off the throne of Spain, and it ended in the Treaty of Utrecht, and in a Bourbon being left on the throne, a result quite harmless to us. The American war was undertaken to keep the colonies in subjection, but it ended in the Treaty of Paris, which confirmed the freedom of the colonies, which everybody now refers to as the happiest thing that could have happened. The other war, practically undertaken to put a Bourbon on the throne of France, succeeded for the moment; but a few years go by, the Bourbon's throne is overturned, and nobody then thinks it worth while to combat against the result. These three wars, for which this comparatively small tax on silver, as well as a great many other big taxes were imposed, signally failed in the objects for which they were undertaken; and he (the Chairman) was very glad when a gentleman like Mr. Watherston put his finger on the cost in the way he had done. After some cursory remarks on the amount of the tax as found by himself in bringing home some Bhooj silver work, he (the Chairman) said he had no doubt, although the trade might oppose it, that the repeal of the duty would do the trade good, and everybody else who was connected with work in silver. In conclusion, he (the Chairman) said that a resolution had been proposed, but it had not been seconded.

Mr. E. J. WATHERSTON, in replying, said it was nearly four years ago since he began this crusade against the silver tax, and he

was now persuaded that the time is rapidly approaching when the impost will be wholly abolished—(hear, hear)—and he must confess himself gratified to find in Sir George Birdwood so able an advocate of the principles he had laid down. Sir George very emphatically condemns the tax upon silver plate, but he still thinks that hall marking is desirable and should be retained. Well, without arguing further whether he was right or wrong, he (Mr. Watherston) would be content with the concession that the removal of the import tax is highly desirable; and when that tax had gone they could see how matters progressed, and perhaps get a reform of the hall-marking laws also. He must repeat that he had no desire to do away with hall marking; what he wanted was the abolition of compulsion in the matter. No silversmith ought to have the right to say that plate *must* be marked; in a free country he claimed that the act should be perfectly optional. Hence, he had no doubt that, if he had the opportunity of a brief chat with Sir George Birdwood, he would have little difficulty in bringing him to the adoption of the views he had expressed regarding hall marking, especially as the principle of freedom was essential to the importation of Indian wares. Mr. Holborn had remarked that the subject of the lecture, as advertised, had not been adhered to; but in this he was mistaken. He (Mr. Watherston) had come to the East India Association to show why Indian plate cannot be brought into this country except at a loss. He would not have ventured to lecture upon Indian plate, as Mr. Holborn seemed to expect, for no doubt the Association were amply acquainted with the merits of Indian productions; all he sought was to show why those productions never had a fair chance in the English market, and to urge that the law should be repealed. Mr. Holborn had also shown how that, in regard to tea and other commodities, while the Government had taken off a certain amount of taxation, the trade had taken off still more in the price, and gave a better article; and he asked whether the silver trade would be prepared to do the same thing? To this he replied, “Yes, most decidedly”—(hear, hear)—when the tax of 1s. 6d. per ounce is taken off. For upon it the manufacturer and the retailer each puts a profit, say, of 20 per cent.; so that, instead of 1s. 6d., it is probable that nearer 2s. 2d. represents the inflation of price consequent upon taxation. He confidently expected that when the tax was removed silver plate would be reduced by from 2s. to 2s. 6d. per ounce. (Hear, hear.) And further, he would answer Mr. Holborn most emphatically that the trade will produce a better article at that reduced price. He quite agreed that a good deal of the plate offered as prizes in this country is a perfect disgrace to the trade; and he quite believed Mr. Farrer in

his description of the search, and the vain search, through London to find something worthy to present to a foreigner—a Frenchman. But he would repeat that when the tax came off there will be an improvement in quality. Mr. Poole had said that there was nothing to hinder a nobleman from buying foreign plate. But what happens when he wants to exchange or sell that plate? (Hear, hear.) Silversmiths cannot buy from him; and he cannot sell without liability to being fined heavily, and at the risk of confiscation of his property, or its being broken up. The quotation from the *Saturday Review* which was made by Mr. Poole was no doubt an exaggeration, but it showed, at any rate, that in the opinion of writers of articles in the leading journals the products of English silversmiths are of such a character, as a rule, as not to be worth buying. Mr. Poole was not able to see that the English silver trade was behindhand, although he knew that Tiffanys, of New York, were miles ahead of us, and took the first gold medal at the last Paris Exhibition. And those who recollected the Exhibition of 1851, and Wagner's beautiful silver table from Vienna, knew that foreigners were a long way in front of us; and the same remark applies in reference to the productions of Munich, Florence, Rome, Rhode Island, and many other places. Mr. Poole said the trade as a body are opposed to the abolition of the silver-plate duty. He (Mr. Watherston) was aware of it, and never concealed it. When the question of free trade was being fought, the Scottish herring-fishers declared themselves to be adherents to the principles of free trade "in everything but herrings," and the silver trade are in much the same case. There is to be free trade in everything but silver plate, because they get 2d. per ounce profit on the duty. That, truly, was a narrow-minded opposition, and he must frankly declare his indifference to it, and his confidence that he would get the tax removed without their assistance, and in spite of their opposition. (Cheers.) Mr. McMinn had alluded to the terrible prospect offered in the fact that the English artificers in silver would suffer much from the removal of the tax, because this country would be flooded with the productions of India, where they work for 2d. a-day. But the same remarks should apply to jewelry, for jewellers in India work for the same small wages. But is the English trade flooded with Indian jewel work? Does work leave this country by reason of the free trade in jewelry? (Hear, hear.) The truth is that that trade is in a more flourishing condition than almost any trade in this country. During the bad times of the last four or five years, he believed he was correct in saying that the goldsmiths' trade of this country has suffered nothing like a serious relapse. The figures from Birmingham

distinctly prove that during all that severe depression the state of the jewelry business was good on the whole. In conclusion, Mr. Watherston expressed his entire agreement with the remark of Mr. Farrer, that it is the duty of Government not to put impediments in the way of any trade, but to permit all trades to get on as they best can without "let or hindrance."

The CHAIRMAN read the resolution as proposed by Mr. Martin Wood, and asked whether any gentleman was disposed to second it?

Mr. R. M. HOLBORN said he would have pleasure in doing so with the addition of the rider :—

"And that in the meantime Her Majesty's Customs should in all cases issue a definite certificate on the receipt of the present duty, in order to facilitate its identity by the Excise at Goldsmiths' Hall."

Mr. W. MARTIN WOOD said he would very willingly accept this addition to his motion.

Thus amended it was put from the Chair and adopted *nem. con.*

Mr. W. MARTIN WOOD remarked that the right hon. Chairman at the opening of the proceedings had made some allusion to chairmen who spoke of things regarding which they knew nothing. That accusation, at any rate, could not be made against him (Sir Arthur Hobhouse), for he had made a valuable and suggestive contribution to the subject under discussion—a contribution which would add to the value and interest of the proceedings when they were published. His duty on behalf of the Council of the East India Association was to move that the best thanks of this meeting are due to the Right Hon. Sir Arthur Hobhouse for presiding on the occasion. (Hear, hear.) He (Mr. Wood) added that he would avail himself of that opportunity to make a remark with regard to Benares brass work to which some allusion had been made. In the returns from which he had already quoted, the value of the export of Benares brass work is set down at 1,23,000 rupees for the same year when only 26,000 rupees' worth of Indian gold and silver work was exported, another disparity which reinforced the conclusions to which he had arrived.


Mr. E. J. WATHERSTON said he had great pleasure in second-

ing the vote of thanks to the Chairman, to whom indeed he felt deeply indebted for his presence and valuable support.

The motion on being put was cordially adopted.

The CHAIRMAN said he would certainly not inflict a second speech upon the meeting. He would only say that if he had had to come through a very foggy atmosphere to reach the Hall he had been amply rewarded by having a very clear discussion, and one ending, as he thought, in a very satisfactory way, and a way which will add a momentum to the movement with which Mr. Watherston is so intimately associated. (Hear, hear.)

The sitting then terminated.



EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION.

Instituted for the independent and disinterested advocacy and promotion, by all legitimate means, of the public interests and welfare of the Inhabitants of India generally.

14, BEDFORD ROW, LONDON, W.C.

President.

SIR RICHARD TEMPLE, BART., G.C.S.I., C.I.E.

Vice-Presidents.

The Most Hon. the Marquis of SALISBURY,
K.G., P.C., M.A., F.R.S., M.R.A.S.
The Most Hon. the Marquis of TWEEDDALE.
The Right Hon. the Earl of SHAFTESBURY,
K.G., F.R.A.S., F.S.S., &c.
Right Hon. Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY.
Right Hon. JAMES STANSFELD, P.C.,
M.P.
Field-Marshal Lord STRATHNAIRN, G.C.B.,
G.C.S.I., Member of H.M.'s Most Hon-
ourable Privy Council of Ireland.
His Highness the Nawab of JOONAGHUR,
K.C.S.I.

His Excellency RAGOONATH ROW.
General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR, K.C.B.,
M.P.
General Sir ARTHUR COTTON, K.C.S.I.
Major-General Sir HENRY RAWLINSON,
K.C.B., K.C.S.I., &c.
The Right Hon. Sir JAMES FERGUSSON,
Bart., C.I.E., Governor of Bombay.
Sir CHARLES EDWARD TREVELYAN, K.C.B.,
F.R.G.S., &c.
Major-General E. W. S. SCOTT, R.A.
Major-General Sir R. WALLACE, K.C.S.I.
Sir DAVID WILDERBURN, Bart., M.P.

COUNCIL, 1881-82.

Chairman—E. B. EASTWICK, Esq., C.B., F.R.S., F.S.A., M.R.A.S.

Vice-Chairman—Sir CHARLES JOHN WINGFIELD, K.C.S.I., C.B., &c.

C. W. ARATHOON, Esq.
Major EVANS BELL, M.R.A.S.
General Sir ORFEUR CAVENAGH, K.C.S.I.
DADABHOY BYRAMJEE, Esq.
DADABHAI NAOROJI, Esq. (in India).
CHRISTOPHER B. DENISON, Esq.
ROBERT H. ELLIOT, Esq.
GEORGE FOGGE, Esq.
Lieut.-Colonel P. T. FRENCH.
JAMSETJI JIVANJI GAZDAR, Esq., M.A.
PATRICK PIRIE GORDON, Esq., J.P., M.A.
JOHN FARLEY LEITH, Esq., Q.C.

Rev. JAMES LONG.
STEPHEN P. LOW, Esq., F.R.G.S.
General Sir GEORGE MALCOLM, K.C.B.
O. C. MURPHY, Esq.
JOHN B. ... Esq.
GEORGE PALMER, Esq., B.C.S.
Captain W. C. PALMER.
Colonel A. B. RATHBORNE.
RAJA RAMPAL SINGH.
P. M. TAIT, Esq., F.R.G.S., F.S.S.
WILLIAM TAYLER, Esq., Retired B.C.S.
W. MARTIN WOOD, Esq.

Acting Secretary.

WALTER HAMILTON BURN, Esq.

Honorary Solicitor.

T. LUXMORE WILSON, Esq.

Bombay Branch.—Office : 18, Sassoon Building, Marine Street.

President—Sir MUNGULDASS NATHOOBHOY, Kt., C.S.I.

Chairman—W. MARTIN WOOD, Esq.

Vice-Chairman—The Hon. RAO SAHEB VISHWANATH NARAYEN MANDLIK, C.S.I.

Honorary Treasurer—ARDASEE FRAMJEE MOOS, Esq.

Honorary Secretaries—KASHINATH TRIMBAK TELANG, Esq., and MANCHERJEE MERWANJEE BHOWNAGRI, Esq.

Bangalore Branch.

Hon. Secretary—RAGHAVA CHARIER, Esq.

Agent at Calcutta—COWASJEE PESTONJEE, Esq., 19, Ezra Street.

Agent at Hong-Kong—PHEROZSHAW PESTONJEE, Esq.

Agent at Madras—J. G. COLEMAN, Esq., C.S.I.

Annual Subscription, including Journal (delivered free of Postage) ...	£1	5	0
Life Subscription ditto ditto ...	14	0	0
Annual Subscription (including Journal) in India ...	13	Rupees	8 Annas.
Life Subscription ditto ditto ...	150		„

No Entrance-Fees.

THE COUNCIL trust that Members will exert their influence to increase the number of Subscribers and otherwise assist in promoting the important object for which the Association has been established.

Although some of the Princes and other Natives of Western India have of late accorded to the Association a liberal pecuniary support, yet its income falls considerably short of that necessary to place it on a permanent footing, and increase its sphere of usefulness.

It is hoped, therefore, that Members will individually aid the Council in this respect, by means of donations, presents of books for the increase of the Library, &c.

Resident Members are furnished with Blank Tickets of Admission to the Lectures, for the use of their friends.

Indian, English, and Vernacular Newspapers, are received and filed in the Reading-room of the Association, in addition to the leading Daily Papers of the Metropolis, and several Weeklies.

The use of the Reading-room and Library is free to Members, who can also have their letters addressed there.

The Secretary will be happy to forward Application Papers, Rules, &c., or give any other information desired.

I.—OBJECTS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

Article 1. The EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION is now instituted for the independent and disinterested advocacy and promotion, by all legitimate means, of the public interests and welfare of the Inhabitants of India generally.

II.—MEMBERS.

Article 2. The Association shall consist of Resident and Non-Resident Ordinary and Honorary Members.

Article 3. Honorary Members shall have the same rights and privileges as Ordinary Members.

Article 4. Honorary Members shall be nominated by the Council at any Ordinary Meeting, and shall consist of persons who have distinguished themselves in promoting the good of India.

Article 5. Ordinary Members shall be nominated in writing by two Members of the Association, and elected after ten days' notice of such nomination, at the next General Meeting of the Council, if approved by a majority of two-thirds present thereat.

Article 6. The Election of every Member, both Ordinary and Honorary, shall be recorded on the minutes of the Council; and the Secretary shall forthwith notify, by letter, his election to the Member, and request such Member to furnish a standing order on his Banker for his Annual Subscription.

Article 7. Ordinary Members shall pay an Annual Subscription of 1l., or 10 Rs., on the 1st January in every year; or may compound for the same by payment of 100 Rs., or 10l., which shall constitute a Life Member.

Note--Total Annual Subscription, including Journal (delivered free of postage)	£1	5	0
Life Subscription ditto ditto		14	0
Annual Subscription (including Journal), in India.....	13	Rupees	8 Annas.
Life Subscription ditto ditto.....	150		„

III.—MODE OF MANAGEMENT.

Article 8. The Management of the Association shall be vested in a Council, consisting of a Chairman, Vice-Chairman, and Thirty-three Ordinary Members; Five to form a Quorum; and Eight to retire annually by Rotation, but eligible for re-election at the Annual Meeting.

Article 9. A President of the Association shall be appointed at the Annual Meeting; and the Council may, from time to time, nominate distinguished Indian Statesmen, or others, as Vice-Presidents, subject to the confirmation of the next Annual Meeting of the Association.

Article 10. The Council shall appoint a Secretary, and such other Employés as may be necessary, and fix their Salaries and Emoluments.

Article 11. The Council may fill up Vacancies in their own body, until the next Annual Meeting of the Association.

Article 12. The Council shall meet on the First Wednesday in the

RULES—(continued).

month; but the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, or any three Members of the Council may at any time convene a Meeting by giving three days' notice.

Article 13. The Council may appoint Special Sub-Committees of not less than Five Members of the Association, three of whom shall form a Quorum.

Article 14. At the desire of Five Members of the Council, or on the written requisition of Ten Members of the Association, the Secretary shall convene a Special Meeting of the Association.

FUNCTIONS OF THE OFFICERS.

Article 15. The President, or, in his absence, any Vice-President, or in the absence thereof, any Member, shall preside at the Annual or Ordinary Meetings of the Association.

Article 16. The Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the Council, or, in their absence, any Member thereof nominated by those present, shall preside at the Meetings of the Council.

ANNUAL MEETING.

Article 17. The Annual Meeting of the Association shall be held in the month of May in every year.

Article 18. General Ordinary Meetings of the Association for promoting the interests thereof, and for the discussion of subjects connected with India, shall be held at such time and places as the Council may appoint.

Article 19. A statement of the Accounts of the Association shall be prepared, audited by one of the Members of the Council and one Member taken from the general body of the Members of the Society, and circulated with the Report of the Council to each Resident Member, ten days before the Annual Meeting.

LOCAL COMMITTEES.

Article 20. Local Committees shall be appointed in India by Local Subscribers, subject to the approval of the Council; and the co-operation of independent Local Associations in India is invited by the "East India Association."

BYE-LAWS.


Article 21. The Council shall have power to make and alter any Bye-laws for the Management of the Association.

ALTERATION OF RULES.

Article 22. No addition to or alteration in these Rules shall be made, except at the Annual Meeting of the Association, previous notice being given in the Circular convening the Meeting.

JOURNAL OF THE ASSOCIATION.

Article 23. The Council may, in their discretion, publish, quarterly or otherwise, a Journal, containing a Report of the several General and other Meetings of the Association. Papers submitted for discussion shall be published *in extenso*, or not, as the Council may decide.



JOURNAL
OF THE
EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION.

Instituted for the independent and disinterested advocacy and promotion, by all legitimate means, of the public interests and welfare of the Inhabitants of India generally.

Inaugural Address

BY SIR RICHARD TEMPLE, BART., G.C.S.I., D.C.L.,
ON ASSUMING THE PRESIDENCY OF THE ASSOCIATION.

A MEETING of the members and friends of the East India Association was held on Monday afternoon, March 13th, 1882, in Doughty Hall, at the rear of the Association's Chambers, 14, Bedford Row, for the purpose of hearing Sir Richard Temple, Bart., G.C.S.I., give an inaugural address on accepting the office of President of the Association.

SIR RICHARD TEMPLE occupied the chair, and amongst those present were the following: General Sir William Wyllie, G.C.B.; General T. A. Duke; Major-General G. Burn; Major-General R. W. Lowry, C.B.; Major-General C. M. Shakespear; Colonel A. H. Campbell; Colonel Nassau Lees; Lieut.-Colonel H. L. Evans; Lieut.-Colonel P. T. French; Captain W. P. Buckham, R.N.; Rev. James Johnston; Rev. James Long; Rev. G. Small; Rev. W. and Mrs. Wingate; Surgeon-General and Mrs. Balfour; Dr. Montague D. Makuna; Dr. Paton; Mr. A. Arathoon; Mr. C. W. Arathoon; Mr. C. N. Banerjee; Mr. George Bain; Mr. Arthur Barclay; Mr. George S. Barnes; Mr. W. Baxter; Mr. C. Boulnois; Mirza Peer Bukhsh; Mrs. Cadell; Mr. A. H. Campbell; Mr. A. Davidson; Mir Dawar Ali; Mr. Francis Day; Dolatoo Surbhai Desai; Mr. W. C. Galton; Mr. D. Ghose; Mr. P. Pirie Gordon; Mr. Robert Graham; Mr. James Hutton; Mr. John Kelsall (M.C.S.); Mr. E. J. Khory; Mr. Roper Lethbridge, C.I.E.; Mr. D. Lewsley; Mr. W. H. Lowry; Miss Manning; Mr. John H. Master; Mr. William McGuffin; Mrs. Metcalfe; Mr. F. G. Millington; Mr. W. C. Niblett;

Mr. Alexander Rogers ; Mr. S. K. Sanjana ; Mr. R. Sen ; Mr. R. D. Sethna ; Mr. John Shaw (Madras) ; Mr. W. Shore-Smith ; Mrs. Shore-Smith ; Mr. D. H. Small ; Mr. R. B. Swinton ; Mr. George Turnbull ; Syed Mohamed Habib Ullah ; Mr. W. Martin Wood ; Mr. and Mrs. A. F. Woodburn ; Miss Wyllie ; Mr. W. Hamilton Burn, Acting Secretary.

Sir RICHARD TEMPLE (who, on rising, was greeted with applause) said : Ladies and Gentlemen,—It now devolves upon me, according to the notification, to deliver to you an inaugural address upon my assuming charge of the honourable office of President of the East India Association. When I was first asked to undertake this office I felt some diffidence and hesitation in doing so ; first, because I am not sure whether all the members of the Association will concur with me in the views which I happen to entertain ; but, as these views have been so often stated publicly, both orally and in writing, I presume you are the best judges of that when you asked me to become your President—(hear, hear)—and, secondly, I hesitated because I am not a permanent resident in London, and I very much doubt whether my many avocations in the country will permit me to discharge adequately the duties of the office. But if I shall find these avocations carry me more and more away from London, as may be hereafter, I shall have to try to find some better man to succeed me. In the meantime I will do my best to discharge the duties adequately. (Hear, hear.) One reason which caused me to accept the office was that the East India Association has now existed for over fifteen years, during which period it has carried considerable weight in influencing public opinion in this country. It has won the support and confidence of the Natives of India ; its representations have been listened to deferentially by some of the highest authorities ; and it has had many great men connected with it. I had the less hesitation in accepting the Presidency when I understood that my immediate predecessor was Sir Laurence Peel—a name honoured and respected by the whole of the Anglo-Indian community. And I also saw that connected with the Association there was a nobleman who has done so much for the cause of humanity all over the world—I mean the venerable Earl of Shaftesbury—(hear, hear)—so distinguished a statesman as the Marquis of Salisbury—(hear, hear)—and three men so well known for everything that relates to the welfare of the people of India, as Sir Bartle Frere, Sir Charles Trevelyan, and Sir Henry Rawlinson, the last of whom I may call an Asiatic statesman. (Hear, hear.) It now devolves upon me to explain to you what, according to my humble comprehension, are the duties, the purposes,

and the functions of this Association. I am not sure, as I said just now, whether all my views will commend themselves at once to every lady and gentleman present; but, at all events, I deem it my duty to tell you what I think on several points, and I am sure you will kindly allow me the same freedom of expression which you would justly claim for yourselves. (Hear, hear.)

Well, then, in the first place, we should remember that our Association consists, firstly, of Anglo-Indians who have retired from active life in India, either official or unofficial; and, secondly, of Natives of India who are resident in England, besides those many excellent members, European and Native, who reside in India. Then our duties seem to me to divide themselves into two main parts—viz., first, to enlighten and inform English opinion, as much as possible, upon all matters relating to India; secondly, to make, from time to time, to the India Office or the authorities in this country such representations as may seem desirable upon the current course of affairs. I do not think we shall ever do much good by making representations direct to the Government of India—indeed, I hardly see how the Government of India can accept such representations from anybody resident in this country; but we may, from time to time, very properly address ourselves to the Secretary of State for India in Council—that is, to the India Office. To do this effectually—that is, firstly, to enlighten public opinion, and, secondly, to make suitable representations to the India Office,—we must take care to post ourselves up to the latest aspect of Indian affairs. As a man recently returned from India, let me assure you that India is changing as fast as, and even faster, than any country in Europe; and although I have only left actual service two years, I feel myself dropping behind, so rapid is the current of Indian affairs. Then, gentlemen, we must get men of original and independent minds—men of suggestive thought, as well as large experience—to come here, and deliver addresses and lectures to us from time to time. But if we are to have men of such independent minds, they will be sure to hold strong and independent opinions, and they will be apt to have ideas directed, or focussed, as it were, on one particular point, and, therefore, in the lectures and addresses there will be various matters which will not command absolute assent. Therefore, I think, in the first place, we must be vigilant not to adopt entirely the theories, crotchets, and hobbies—if I may so express myself—which will be from time to time presented to us. Gentlemen, we desire to have the advantage of the hobbies; only we must not, we cannot, undertake to ride them ourselves. We desire also to hear the crotchets, as they may prove instructive and interesting; only we a

an Association, do not undertake to retail them as pure metal, with our own hall-mark—as I may express it—attached to them. It will be the duty of the President or the Chairman, whoever he may be, I apprehend, to take care that, while individual views are thus unreservedly ventilated, several other members of the Association shall, if possible, advance conflicting arguments, and then it will fall to him to sum up, in order that something like a moderate and safe conclusion may be arrived at by the Association. (Hear, hear.) Then I am sure, gentlemen, in stating this point about crotchets or hobbies, I am not evolving anything out of my inner consciousness, for I am impressed, on a perusal of the back records of the Association, by finding that strong and peculiar views have been enunciated quite unreservedly and without any thought of what might be urged from other directions. Then, gentlemen, another thing to guard against is this: we have many accomplished and learned Native gentlemen in this Association. With all deference to our Native fellow-subjects in this country, I must say that they occasionally make speeches in public which are really, as efforts of oratory or rhetoric, honourable to them, but which nevertheless teem with exaggeration. The Native gentleman, speaking in England, is apt to state his case with a good deal of Eastern imagination and Oriental imagery, which may elicit a passing cheer, but which ends in distorting the subject, so that, after all, we have, not a picture, but a caricature. Now, I would warn my Indian fellow-subjects that the English people are, above all things, plain-judging, accurate, and discriminating; and although any exaggeration may, for the moment, evoke applause, nevertheless, in the end, it will prevent the speaker carrying the weight to which his statements would otherwise entitle him. Another source of danger is the running into the extreme of what is now-a-days called pessimism. There is the other extreme—optimism—of course; but, on the whole, optimism is a safer thing than pessimism, because pessimism is apt to make the people of England despair regarding the future of India, and begin to ask themselves, “If the country is in such a wretched state, if agriculture is being carried on at a loss, and the people are too thick upon the land, and are gradually starving, what is the use of taking any interest in such a declining Empire?” (Hear, hear.) If we countenanced such representations, our Association would soon lose moral weight upon public opinion, and we should be roughly contradicted by a reference to the plainest facts of the day. Nevertheless we need not be thought to discourage any pessimist members who may honour us by addressing us, because no doubt they do some good in warning the Government and the public of the dangers which beset the paths of even the wariest of administrators.

Another thing to avoid is anything like the advocacy of personal and particular interests. I mention that because I have observed in one of the rules of the Association some indication of an intention to help Native gentlemen who may come to this country to agitate particular causes or claims of their own, in respect to agency. Of course, it is well if we can guard any Native Princes or gentlemen who may come into this country against falling into the hands of unscrupulous agents; but as regards agency by the Association, it is certain that once we enter upon that path, we shall be regarded as an Association taking up particular claims, and shall rapidly lose influence over the public opinion of this country. (Hear, hear.) It is well that Native Princes and Chiefs should be members of this Association, and some are contributing generously towards our funds; nevertheless Native Princes should clearly understand that whatever they contribute to the Association is not for the sake of their class, or for the sake of any individual in it, or for the sake of any class, but for the sake of the country at large and the people of India in the aggregate. (Hear, hear.)

One more word of the dangers to which we are subject. I understand that some of the Native gentlemen who are resident in this country are apt to fall into some of the atheistic ways so current in the present age. Now, we may admit that there are many temptations to this path; nevertheless I hold that we should really, as Christians and as Englishmen, warn our Native fellow-subjects in this country that the English people will, in the mass, give no countenance to what passes for "free thought" or atheism in their Indian fellow-subjects. They will not, indeed, ask the Natives to become Christians, as the adoption of Christianity must be the result of private conviction. They will even acknowledge thankfully the religious sentiment which pervades many of the new sects among the Hindus which are rising into prominence—the Brahmos and others. They will sympathize with the moral, intellectual, and spiritual views and religious aspirations and difficulties of their Asiatic fellow-subjects; but to anything like atheism they can never lend their countenance. (Hear, hear.) Our Native fellow-subjects may be certain that, despite all the alleged tendencies of the nineteenth century, there is as much religious earnestness now in England as in any preceding century, and in many important respects so much more than there ever has been,—enough to justify the assertion that in the main the English are a religious and God-fearing people.

I hope I may be excused for having so unreservedly stated the dangers that I think beset an Association like this; and now I should

like, in the briefest and most rapid manner, to recapitulate some important matters to which our attention should be constantly directed, and upon which our gaze should ever be fixed. These subjects are, first, material, and, secondly, moral and social.

Now, among the many objects of material importance to India, the first appears to me to be the application of British capital to the development of the resources of the country. This application of capital will be partly private and partly public (that is, expended some by individuals or corporations, and some by the Government), and it should be our endeavour to gather up the threads of all valuable information which may be interesting to the individual capitalist and to the moneyed classes who are likely to invest some of their accumulated savings in the improvement of India. One great application of capital will be that on the part of the Government. The Government capital will be utilized largely for purposes of irrigation; and we who have lived in India can never do wrong in keeping the claims of irrigation constantly before the public of England and the Government of India—(hear, hear)—and more particularly as experience shows that this is a matter which the private capitalist cannot conveniently compass. Several Irrigation Companies have tried, and have not succeeded; and thus the most important means to the material improvement of India, if attended to at all, must be taken in hand by the Government. Then as regards railways, we are assured that much has been done by the State and much more by those justly honoured and now historic Guaranteed Companies. This matter of railways offers a field to which private capital may be greatly attracted, provided only the branch railways which remain to be made in the future shall be constructed in a cheap and economical style; indeed, what may be called temporary railways, which can be worked to the benefit of the country, and at the same time be sufficiently good to pay interest to the private capitalists who may invest in them. Then, gentlemen, another matter which we cannot too earnestly impress on the attention of all concerned is sanitation. This is a matter to be advocated from England through English opinion. There is no matter which more entirely concerns the physical welfare of the Indian people; nevertheless, there is no matter regarding which the Natives of India show so little thought and so little appreciation. That being the case, it becomes the more incumbent upon us, as civilized foreigners, to press this matter upon our Native fellow-subjects, and, secondly, upon public opinion, in the conviction that what England thinks to-day India will think to-morrow, or, at least, the day after. Another matter upon which opinion in India is as yet uninstructed, both amongst

Natives and Europeans, is the subject of forestry. I rejoice that this most important matter—which nearly concerns the future climatic condition of India, which fully explains the sequence of droughts and famines, and the like—is being earnestly taken up by the Society of Arts in London, and by the Scottish Arboricultural Society of Edinburgh. Then, gentlemen, there is the closely related subject of the use of manure. The great desideratum for Indian agriculture is manure. The soil is becoming exhausted, slowly and imperceptibly perhaps, but still surely, owing to the non-application of manure for its proper purpose. What should be used as manure is largely used for fuel, because there is no wood-supply available; and the absence of a wood-supply arises from there being no adequate system of forestry; and that, again, is ascribable to the want of education of public opinion in this most essential matter. Nevertheless the Association will be glad to hear that great improvements have been made of late years by the Indian Government in this respect, and we have what may be fairly claimed as the greatest forest department in the world; but it is small compared with the wants of the country.

Then, as regards the land, there are two or three points to which I think we should diligently attend. First, there is the extension of tenant-right. The rights of landlords, great and small, the status of peasant proprietors, and the occupancy cultivators and sub-proprietors, are, on the whole, well arranged throughout India; but there still remains much to be done regarding a class which numbers many millions—the ordinary cultivators and tenants-at-will. Here, I say, much remains to be done; and I earnestly hope that the advocacy of this Association will never be wanting towards that end. Another matter nearly concerning the welfare of the great peasant proprietary, who form the very backbone of the country and people, is a reform in the law of debtor and creditor. It is the peasant indebtedness which, in spite of our good administration and the improvements in property in land, is one of the curses of the country; and although I think most highly of our enlightened legislation, as a rule, and regard it as pregnant with blessings to the people, it is very defective in this respect. Another matter regarding which this Association might exercise an influence for good, is emigration. There is no doubt that, although India can well sustain all the 250,000,000 of people who stand upon its surface, although she has much waste land available, there are, notwithstanding, many districts which are utterly overpopulated, and in which the population greatly increases every decade. These districts may well send forth hundreds of thousands to create new Indias in the Tropics, or to colonize in

Madagascar, the West Indies, or South America. Well now, this is a matter in which this Association may exercise a beneficial influence. We may constantly obtain information regarding the condition of those classes who may be prepared to send forth labourers; that information we may constantly communicate to those classes in this country who are interested in our colonies. All those colonies which I have mentioned, and several others, have representatives in this country—representatives who are always inquiring about the supply of cheap labour from India. Let us keep them thoroughly informed on that point.

Then, again, from time to time, it may be well for us to say something about opium. That is a matter upon which there is a great divergency of opinion. I, for one, wholly differ from those benevolent and excellent people who are raising an agitation on the subject in this country; and, as an experienced man, having observed the use and abuse of the drug, and knowing what really are the habits of the Asiatic populations, whether Indian or Chinese, I am prepared to justify our present position. One large item of revenue enjoyed by India is from opium, and it is quite as legitimate a revenue as that which the English Government derive from the excise or customs on wines and spirits. (Hear, hear.) If, then, we believe that opium in moderation is no more harmful to the Chinese than wine and beer are to the English people; if we believe that the taxation levied by the Indian Government on opium, instead of encouraging consumption, rather checks it by making the drug dear; if we believe that nothing but harm can come to the Chinese themselves from the destruction of that revenue—which revenue really renders the drug expensive,—then, I say, it is our duty to lend our weight and our support to the authorities, and to make such representations as shall bring conviction to the minds of those sensible classes in England who are ready to be convinced when good reason is given them. (Applause.)

Trusting that you will excuse my running so rapidly over the subjects, I will at once turn to the second division of my theme—viz., the moral and social improvements in which our advocacy may be beneficial to the people of India. The first of these, of course, is education; and education is, of all others, the most legitimate subject for our deliberations. You hear a great deal about high education *versus* low education; and there are many people who will speak disparagingly before the English public regarding the results of high education in India. Let me assure you, as one who has but recently returned from that country, that the high education afforded mainly by the Government

and partly by private institutions, chiefly missionary, has been fraught with great blessings to the upper and middle classes of the people of India. It is not alone that their intellects have been improved, but their moral tone has been raised, and they have become trustworthy gentlemen. In fact, the improvement, the mental and moral elevation, which has resulted is greater than I ever expected to live to see. That being the case, we should not countenance those who would disparage that high education merely because it is wished to advocate primary education. People in this, as in other things, look at only one side; they perceive the benefits of primary education, and get all their mental rays concentrated upon it, and so they see no benefit from high education. High education is, as I have said, carried on mainly by the Government, but partly by private agencies. Some people think that the private agencies, which chiefly consist of missionary institutions, could be left to undertake all that is necessary in respect of high education. Now, having been myself an earnest advocate of Missions, and being necessarily very well acquainted with all the operations of the great Missionary Societies in India, I venture to affirm that the Missionary Societies have done already their utmost in respect of high education, and have not the means to do more than they are doing in this respect. If high education were left to them alone, they would not prove equal to the task; and, therefore, if high education is to be adequately afforded, the Indian Government must do a great deal. It may be that the Government operations could be improved; it may be that their assistance is more needed in the interior of the country than in the Presidency towns. In the interior of the country you find very few men well educated; and the only chance of increasing the number of the colleges in the interior of the country is by the intervention of the Government. It is most important that Government should not compete injuriously with private institutions; and Government does not do so. On the contrary, the fees of the Government colleges are higher than those of the missionary colleges, and quite as high as the people can afford to pay. Throughout India the rule has been that Government shall give one-half, and the people one-half; and that rule, on the whole, is carried out from the top to the bottom of our educational system. You will find that those who receive a high education pay half of the cost. We should be glad if they could be made to pay more; but if you make high education too expensive in India, you will restrict it to the well-to-do and the rich, and that, I am sure, no Indian philanthropist would wish to do. We desire to raise up any Natives of talent to whatever class they belong, and it would

be hopeless for such men—youths of genius and of high moral qualifications—to get superior education if they have the misfortune to be born of poor parents ; and, therefore, if the fees must be kept high, we must agitate for a large number of scholarships to be constantly offered by the Government for competition by the best youths throughout the whole Empire of India, with the effect that the youth who wins a scholarship gets his education almost gratuitously, and that, in order to win this, he must have capacity and character above his compeers. So much, then, for high education. Now, as regards primary education, no doubt that is the crying want of India ; for although, recollect, you have as large a number as 2,000,000 of students in your schools, which may sound very fine, after all it is a very small number relatively to the number of people in India. What are 2,000,000 among 250,000,000 ? You have 3,000,000 of children at school in Great Britain, where the population is not one-ninth as large as in India ; so that there is a great distinction between the development of education in England and in India. Primary education is the *crux* of Indian administration ; you will find it a most difficult problem that awaits solution. I fear very much that before long we shall have to come to compulsion. (Hear, hear.) It has been accepted by every great nation of Europe, and now is at work in a milder form among the English people. And though I do not recommend that compulsion should be attempted universally in India, I do not forget that the students—boys—come chiefly from the artisan class, and very little from the agricultural class, and it is the agricultural class which is most important, and which most needs education. I am sure, then, there are many sections of the agricultural class to whom a certain sort of compulsion might be applied, if the Government had the moral courage to do so. (Hear, hear.) It is by an Association such as ours investigating these matters, and making due representations to the public and to the Government, that an effect will be produced on the Legislature, and something will be done to compel the proprietary classes, at least, in India to educate their sons. Only by such means will education be made effective. Much, too, must be done towards the encouragement of vernacular literature. I suppose that one of the most important problems we had to solve in India was that we found no vernacular literature worth mentioning. But within fifty years we have created a vernacular literature, which, though it may not be fully understood by ourselves, has been pronounced by scholars in France and Germany to be among the greatest of the many glories of England in the East ; though much

remains to be done before all the 60,000 schools which exist in India are properly supplied with class-books. This is a matter upon which we may not only offer information, but great encouragement, to many persons in this country who may be disposed to assist the Natives of India in the direction of improving their vernacular literature; and though the Society for Promoting Christian Vernacular Education has, no doubt, a religious object, with which we shall sympathize, but which we cannot directly promote, it still must be conceded that that Society is doing yeoman's work in the extension of the vernacular literature of India. (Hear, hear.)

Well, gentlemen, before I quit the subject of education (and I hope I am not fatiguing you by this exposition), I must remind you that the best opinions now concur in this,—that hitherto our education has been too exclusively literary and philosophic, and not sufficiently practical and scientific. We are doing much in one or two great branches of applied science—in medicine and in civil engineering—but there are still important fields in which much remains to be done, especially in those sciences—like chemistry, botany, mineralogy, geology, and physical geography—which have an obvious practical value. Above all, there is agriculture. I suppose there is no matter so important for the future welfare of India as the diffusion of agricultural education; and if we are to apply anything like compulsion upon the agricultural classes, in respect to having their children educated, we must take care that the primary instruction shall be of a practical character; and if so, above all things, it must be agricultural. Nothing would exert so powerful an effect as a reason for our having to take any stringent or compulsory measures as the certainty that agriculture was the first and foremost subject of the national education.

Further, we may do much as regards rendering the industrial arts of India popular, and respected by our fellow-countrymen in England. There was a danger at one time lest, while exhibiting to the Native mind the fruits of European art and culture, we should choke and stifle their own. That danger, however, has been overpassed, and now the real merits of Indian art are beginning to be appreciated in this country; and it is even recognized that, despite all the advantages which our Western civilization has given us, we are really, as artists, not equal, nationally, to the Indians, the Chinese, or the Japanese; setting aside, of course, the individual artists of genius who may be among us. But still, this is a field in which the East India Association may still do much to gradually enlighten our English fellow-countrymen respecting the

Native artistic tendencies hereditarily transmitted among them from generation to generation, and respecting the many beautiful fabrics of India. This fact reminds me of a matter of trade and duties, which, perhaps, I ought to have mentioned before. It is this: we must all have hailed with satisfaction the recent announcement from India that all duties have been remitted by the Government upon articles imported from England. That is a reformation which I myself have long advocated, and I am delighted to see it accomplished. But we may well begin to ask for some reciprocity in this matter—(hear, hear)—for there are many articles coming from India to England upon which very considerable duties are levied. One of these—the duty on silver plate—was discussed at a recent meeting of the Association; and there are others, such as the duties on tea, coffee, and the like. The encouragement of a reasonable agitation for the removal of these hindrances to Indian trade with this country would really be a most useful work on the part of the Association.

Reverting now to the subject of education, before I finally leave it, I should like to remind you that whatever progress we have made as regards the instruction of boys and men, the progress is extremely small as regards women and girls. (Hear, hear.) But while I am not very sanguine of our making much additional and further progress with men and boys without compulsion, yet I am very sanguine of great voluntary progress among the girls and women of India. That is one of the things in which I believe we shall see a great change in the next generation; and English ladies may exercise a graceful and beneficial influence in that direction. This is a matter in which the first spring and impulse must be given from England, and among the many important needs of India, none is more important than this. (Hear, hear.) It is quite within the power of the ladies of England to exercise a direct and powerful influence in the education of their Indian sisters; and if we, as an Association, constantly urge the claims of this subject upon the attention of the many benevolent and highly educated ladies in England who are willing and anxious to do some good and prove a benefit to humanity, we shall have an increasing number of ladies going out to India to carry the influences of education into the homes of Indian ladies—places where the ordinary schoolmistress and, still less, the schoolmaster can hardly ever reach.

Gentlemen, in connection with education, there is still a subject of great importance. Although I suppose religion is a matter in which we can undertake no direct interposition, nevertheless, I can assure

you that although Christian Missions are distinctly religious, and have avowedly a Christian character, they are, on the whole, thoroughly popular with the Natives of India; and this seems to teach us that the more we advocate the claims of our own religion, the more we show ourselves determined to abide by its dictates, the more we are respected as a nation by the millions of people whom Providence has committed to our charge. While religious matters, however, are beyond our province as an Association, yet the social, moral, and political effects of the Missions have great claims on your advocacy.

There are still one or two social points with which I must conclude my address. First of all, there is the subject of statistics. No doubt we are in possession of Indian statistics, but they are not systematized. They are in vast detail, indeed, but in the mass; they are not fully collated; though even in regard to collation much progress has recently been made. That is a subject with which an Association like this could well deal, and with the result of finding countless matters in regard to which statistical information is required by the public. Information of a valuable character no doubt exists in the labyrinthine pigeon-holes of the offices of India, but it is not arranged as it might be, or put in the form which would render it useful. This is a matter towards which our attention should be directed.

Another thing is the improvement of the arrangements for the admission of Natives into the Covenanted Civil Service; and this is a matter which will have the sympathy of members of the Association. It has been too much accepted as an axiom in India that the Natives, when highly educated, are fitted for the judicial service, but not for the administrative, or the highest branches of administration. Our object should be to render the Natives fit to be administrators; and we shall not, in my opinion, have done our duty until we make them so fit. We have already turned out completely educated Natives in some branches of natural philosophy and of law. Especially in law have we succeeded: we have made them effective advocates, and upright, discriminating judges. We have remaining the duty of rendering them able magistrates and first-rate collectors; and, I repeat, we shall not have done our duty by them until we have made them administrators. (Hear, hear.) This is a point on which our rule compares unfavourably with Native rule. Native rule elicited the administrative genius which exists among the Natives, and we may hope so to arrange our education as to produce similar results and train up Native statesmen. Another

thing is to encourage, as much as possible, the assignment of honorary public offices to Native gentlemen. The idea of a benevolent despotism—that everything shall be done for the people, and nothing by the people—is not the object of such a government as ours. Everything, indeed, should be done for the people, but we should induce the people to do as much as possible for themselves, and make them feel their responsibility for it. And that can best be effected by constantly inducing Natives of character to undertake honorary offices—to serve as honorary magistrates, judges of Conciliation Courts, as jurymen, and the like ; to sit on school and road committees, and be Municipal Commissioners. The more we do in that direction the more we shall be carrying out the true principles of moral education, which not only seeks to discipline the intellect, but also forms the character. Above all things in respect to honorary offices, we should encourage what may be called the principle of the elective franchise, and provide that candidates be elected by the vote of their countrymen. That principle has long obtained in the Municipality of Bombay; and, seeing that, some years ago I determined to carry it out in Calcutta. There was much opposition at the time, but the elective system has triumphed, the object being to make the educated Bengalees of the middle classes take an interest in the affairs of the capital city, and elect men of character and independence to fill the honourable office of Municipal Commissioner. And the more we carry out that principle in every part of the country the better it will be for us and for India. I rejoice to observe it stated that the Government of India, in connection with the development of provincial finance, will encourage the Local Governments to associate with themselves, in the work of local financial administration, Native gentlemen elected by the voice of their fellow-countrymen. It would be, I believe, a most desirable thing for men to be elected in the same way to seats in the Legislative Councils, instead of being appointed as they are now. The difficulty would be to find constituencies, but this might be arranged. Men thus elected would have a greater interest in their work, and they would speak with greater weight in the Councils. There could be no danger in this, because it does not follow that you need give any majority to them. Government may still retain, as now—and it must do so for a long time to come—an absolute majority in the Legislature for its own officers ; but there is no reason why there should not be an influential minority composed of Native gentlemen of first-rate character and status, elected by their countrymen.

I must conclude now by mentioning just two things which we should avoid. I have mentioned the main points in the material, moral, and social condition of India in which we may usefully employ our influence; but we ought, I submit, to forbear from entering upon the wide controversy with reference to the currency, which will infallibly lead us into the mazes of Bi-metallism, from which we shall not easily escape. The talent of all the experts in Europe is exercising itself in this matter, and nothing is wanted from us to add to the already too abundant literature on the subject. Then—although the subject is of great interest and importance—I am afraid we must avoid Central Asian politics. I observe there have been papers read on this subject, and I do not disparage its importance and its interest to India,—indeed, I believe it much more important to the welfare of India than is commonly supposed; but, unfortunately, it has been thoroughly mixed up with party spirit in this country, and there would be great difficulty in getting the matter discussed with impartiality. Therefore, I would recommend that the subject be kept out of our discussions; for, let me remind you, nothing is so dangerous to the welfare of India as that our dealings with our Indian fellow-subjects should become matters of party strife in this country. (Applause.) Formerly, these matters were quite free from such strife; but I have observed within the last ten years a great and regrettable deterioration in that respect—so much so, indeed, that it is difficult to find important Indian matters which have not become more or less tinged with the kaleidoscope of party. I hope the Association will keep its non-political character, and continue to advise the Natives of India not to allow their affairs to be mixed up with either of the contending parties in English politics; for if they espouse one party, they are apt to be discredited with the party they do not espouse. They should remember, amid the ebbing and flowing, the surging and falling, of the tide of English opinion, that their object should be, if I may say so, to keep well with both parties, and let it be thoroughly understood, whatever party is in power, that party should be doing its utmost, as it has hitherto done, for the general welfare of the Indian people. (Hear, hear.)

Lastly, there is one duty we should constantly perform; that is, to hold out the hand of fellowship to every Native gentleman who visits this country. There are already some clubs and institutes which offer them a home: it should be our pride and our duty to offer them information, and to place at their disposal the results of our knowledge; for such knowledge must be regarded in connection with the best interests of India. We should strive, by these and other means,

to create a favourable impression on the minds of our Indian fellow-subjects who visit our shores, by making their associations with England happy, so that they may carry back with them to India pleasing recollections of English people and things. We shall thus produce impressions which will be favourable to us as a nation, and tend to render us popular in our Eastern Empire. (Hear, hear.) I am sure that those of us who have spent many of their best days in that country still look back to it with the fondest recollections; and though, while we were in the country, we saw the faults as well as the merits of our Native fellow-subjects, now that we have left the country, the memory of the faults has faded, while the remembrance of the merits and the virtues becomes brighter and stronger. Feeling this, let us try to carry out to the fullest and most legitimate conclusion all those measures which have been advocated by our predecessors in this Association, and which have, during the course of fifteen years, done so much good. Let us look back on the fifteen years that have passed, and promise ourselves that the next fifteen years shall be at least as fruitful of results, so far as the operations of the East India Association may extend.

Sir Richard Temple was warmly applauded at the conclusion of his lengthened address.

Mr. P. M. TAIT said he had been called upon quite unexpectedly to move, "That the Council and members of this Association beg to record their best thanks to Sir Richard Temple for accepting the "Presidentship of the Association." He need not say that he had sincere pleasure in moving a vote of thanks to Sir Richard, especially after the very able address which they had just heard. In the case of an inaugural address, it was not usual to debate the topics introduced, and, therefore, he would confine his remarks to the speaker rather than to what he said. He might remind the meeting that Sir Richard Temple was educated at Haileybury, and landed at Calcutta, in 1847, as a covenanted member of the Civil Service of India. He had served under Lord Hardinge, who was then Governor-General, and under every Governor-General since that time, up to and including Lord Lytton. He had also filled many high posts in connection with the administration of our Empire in India, having at last risen to be Governor of Bombay. India was known as the nursery of statesmen and soldiers, and the President of the Society had that day indicated that it was also a school for orators. To speak for about eighty minutes without notes, touching on so many difficult, social, and

economic problems, was in itself no slight achievement. Sir Richard Temple was well known as the author of several important works in connection with India. The latest, published by John Murray, is entitled "Men and Events of My Time in India," and is well worthy of perusal by all interested in the administration of that great dependency. The concluding chapters of the book were highly interesting and most important. He there takes, as it were, a bird's-eye view of the whole conditions of the case in India, and in answering the question, "Is British rule safe in India; is it substantially safe, and based on the foundation of permanent stability?" he arrives at the very satisfactory conclusion that "British rule has within the country and among the people a clear balance in its favour. By its just administration, and by its right arm, it renders this balance quite overwhelming. It is, therefore, substantially safe; it is, indeed, grandly secure at the present time." If he was not mistaken, Sir Richard was for some years Finance Minister in India, and must, therefore, take exceptional interest in Major Baring's Budget, the heads of which are telegraphed from India and appeared in the *Times* of that day. Major Baring's Budget seems to have been accepted and passed by the Council without a division. Its most important characteristic is said to be that it is a "Charter of Free Trade for India," but, as has been pointed out, we still levy duties on their produce—on Indian tea, for example! There can be little doubt that capital on a more extensive scale is now about to be directed to that country, to take its chance, without any State guarantee. Whatever grows will grow there; and it is simply incredible that while we have here Consols at a price above par, while we have lent some hundreds of millions sterling to bankrupt and defaulting foreign States, the great and rich dependency of India has been comparatively overlooked by private capitalists. There can be little doubt that we are now entering upon a new era, and that British capital and enterprise is about to be more largely employed in the development of our great Eastern dependency. In conclusion, Mr. Tait said that after the statesmanlike and picturesque address to which they had all listened, they would cordially congratulate themselves, as members of the Association, on having secured the services of so talented, practical, and earnest a man as Sir Richard Temple for their President. (Hear, hear.)

Lieut.-Colonel P. T. FRENCH cordially seconded the motion.

Mr. W. MARTIN WOOD joined in congratulating the East India

Association on the accession of Sir Richard Temple as their President. In his very practical and suggestive address he had lectured them well as to what they must avoid, and, doubtless, by-and-by he would go further, and tell them more in detail what they ought to do. He (Mr. Wood) confessed he was under a misapprehension—no doubt his own fault—as to the theme Sir Richard would dilate upon. He had rather expected their new President would speak of the same subject that he treated so ably the other day at Leeds—viz., “The Value of India to England.” However, Sir Richard would probably do this before the season is over; and he might, by anticipation, say that exposition of that topic was very much needed. The occasion which had caused their assembly to-day would remind many of that in May, 1867, when Lord Lyveden, the first President of the Association, accepted the office and gave a short address. He was followed by a Native gentleman, to whom the East India Association were under great obligations, and whose name was never mentioned there without much respect—Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Dadabhai dilated upon England’s duty to India, and most of what he said is as apposite now as it was in 1867. He showed how enormous were the profits and advantages which, by one means or other, England has derived from her possession of India, and, pointing the same moral as Sir Richard Temple, he impressed on the people of England that it was alike their duty and their interest to do all that is possible to accelerate the progress of India and the increased prosperity of its people. The statistics appended to that paper by Mr. Dadabhai—though since amplified by that gentleman himself, by Mr. Knight, and others—are still very valuable. One word might be suffered, in some sort of apology of certain episodes in the past history of the East India Association. Sir Richard Temple had hinted—and, doubtless, with some truth—that the Association had allowed some scope to hobby-riders and crotcheteers; but when this had happened, the reports showed that any evil which might have arisen was reduced to a minimum by the fair, ample, and searching discussions which, according to the rule and method of the Association, followed the reading of all papers. One-sided views, therefore, did not gain acceptance; they were made to appear in their proper proportion. Hence he would venture to say that it was scarcely possible to find, anywhere out of official records, so thorough and searching an exposition of many leading topics connected with Indian administration and affairs as can be found in the *Journal of the East India Association*. (Hear, hear.) He trusted, therefore, that, under the impulse given by their new President, the future issue of the *Journal* would even excel the past

series in variety and value. In this connection, he desired to mention that the Council had just received a letter from the Managing Committee of the Bombay Branch of the East India Association, remitting the sum of 3,000 rupees to the Parent Association, in which they state that they did so with the specific object of having the *Journal* issued regularly, with greater frequency. They urged that three or four numbers should be issued every year. This showed that the East India Association has an echo in India, and that its efforts are appreciated. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. E. J. KHORY expressed himself highly gratified at the able and comprehensive address of the President. His opinions on Indian matters were to be highly regarded because of his distinguished career, and especially on account of his exertions for the benefit of the people of India at the time of emergency. At that critical time, the hour of danger, he (Sir Richard Temple) was on the spot to assist, even as the fire-engine on the spot to extinguish fire. Indeed, he (the speaker) might be pardoned for indulging in the remark, "Speak of the angel, and he is there." Sir Richard Temple was highly appreciated in India, and the Northbrook Club, which had among its members many distinguished Anglo-Indians, had elected Sir Richard Temple as its President. If he (Mr. Khory) were to hear now or hereafter that there is a movement on foot in India with the expressed object of bringing together the rulers and the ruled in friendly intercourse and social relation, and if he were informed that Sir R. Temple is the originator of such movement, he would not be at all surprised. Finally, Mr. Khory repeated his expression of admiration for the President, who was devoting his powerful body and equally powerful mind to the benefit of the people of India, and added that the address they had just listened to was evidence of the facility of Sir Richard's mind, such as suggested to him (Mr. Khory) the words, "Coming events cast their shadows before."

MIRZA PEER BUKHSH, while thanking Sir Richard Temple for his able review of the circumstances of India and the work of the East India Association, passed on to excuse the tone of apparent exaggeration in Native speakers to which the President had referred, and was criticising adversely the policy of Major Baring's Budget, when

Mr. P. M. TAIT referred to his previous suggestion that the occasion was not one for a general debate; and thereupon

MIRZA PEER BUKHSH said he would reserve his remarks for a future occasion, as the hour was late, and he was anxious not to trespass.

The motion was then put, and carried by acclamation.

In responding, Sir RICHARD TEMPLE expressed his thanks for the very cordial manner in which the resolution had been adopted. Incidentally, he might be allowed to assure the honourable member who had just sat down (Mirza Peer Bukhsh) that they would be at all times glad to hear the Natives of India express their views without reserve, but the main factor of the moment was the question of time. For this he feared he was chiefly to blame, since he had, with his inaugural address, occupied so long a time of the sitting—longer than he had intended. But, as it was, time was valuable in the City of London in this busy season, and other engagements must be kept by gentlemen in attendance; and hence the interesting and valuable observations of the preceding speakers were curtailed. With regard to what fell from his friend Mr. Martin Wood with regard to the assumption that his opening address would be upon the "Value of India to England," he might say that he understood that he would be addressing a body of experts who were already thoroughly acquainted with that fact. (Hear, hear.) Of course, he knew that it was one of the subjects upon which this Association should endeavour to enlighten public opinion in this country, but it did not occur to him as an appropriate topic for an inaugural address to the members. (Hear, hear.) He might add that, whether as President or in any other capacity, he should lose no opportunity—as he had not lost any—of impressing on the people of this country the value of India to them. He had already done so on many platforms in the country, and before varied audiences—more particularly large assemblies of British electors—and, as he hoped, with a moderate degree of success. (Hear, hear.)

The sitting then terminated.

By Whom is India Governed?

PAPER BY JOHN DACOSTA, Esq.,

READ AT A MEETING HELD IN DOUGHTY HALL, 14, BEDFORD ROW, W.C.,
ON THURSDAY AFTERNOON, MARCH 23RD, 1882.

MR. ALDERMAN FOWLER, M.P., IN THE CHAIR.

A MEETING of the members of the East India Association, and others interested in the affairs of India, was held in Doughty Hall, in the rear of the Association's Chambers, 14, Bedford Row, W.C., on Thursday afternoon, March 23rd, 1882; the subject for consideration being an address delivered by John Dacosta, Esq., on "By Whom is India Governed?"

Mr. Alderman FOWLER, M.P., occupied the chair, and amongst those present were the following: Sir George Yule, C.B., K.C.S.I.; Mr. George Palmer, M.P.; Major-General G. Burn; Major-General Lowry, C.B.; Major-General J. Puckle; Lieut.-Colonel H. L. Evans; Lieut.-Colonel R. E. Huxham; Lieut.-Colonel T. N. Young; Mr. J. R. Bullen-Smith, C.I.E.; Surgeon-General and Mrs. Balfour; Dr. Cullimore; Surgeon-General and Mrs. Gordon; Deputy Surgeon-General Hollingsworth; Dr. Montague; D. Makuna; Mr. R. H. Abbott, C.E.; Mr. A. Arathoon; Mr. C. W. Arathoon; Mr. George Bain; Mr. Robert Bain; Mr. C. N. Banerjee; Mirza Peer Bukhish; Mr. H. W. Freeland; Mr. P. Pirie Gordon; Mr. S. M. Israil; Mr. John Kelsall (M.C.S.); Mr. E. J. Khory; Mr. O. C. Mullick; Mr. Alexander Rogers; Mr. T. Ryan; Mr. S. K. Sanjána; Mr. John Shaw (Madras); Mr. Smollett; Mr. S. M. Habib Ullah; Mr. W. Wedlake; Mr. W. Martin Wood; Mr. W. Hamilton Burn, Acting Secretary.

In opening the proceedings, the CHAIRMAN said his first duty was to call upon Mr. John Dacosta to read what he happened to know was a very interesting paper, because he had been afforded an opportunity of a previous perusal of it.

Mr. JOHN DACOSTA said the title of the paper which he was about to submit to the Association was suggested by the perplexity which he felt, in common with many others, upon observing on certain

occasions a remarkable divergence between the action pursued by the Indian Government and the views enunciated on the same subject by the Secretary of State for India. He would therefore state, as the title did not indicate the full purpose of the paper, that his object has been to show certain evil effects which have sprung from weak points in the system of government adopted on the extinction of the East India Company, and to suggest in what direction a remedy might be found for the same. The speaker then read the following paper :—

The system of administration under which India is governed has not been materially modified since its adoption in 1858-61 ; nor has any inquiry been instituted to ascertain how far the machinery then established has served its intended purposes. That the results of the system have in some respects been very unsatisfactory, became apparent some ten years ago, when the curtain which concealed its defects and their deleterious action on the country was suddenly cast aside by the publication of Lord Mayo's able State paper, in which that highly distinguished and unfortunate Viceroy declared : " A feeling of discontent and dissatisfaction exists among every class on account of the increase of taxation that has been going on ; and the continuation of that feeling is a political danger, the magnitude of which can hardly be over-estimated."

Several Parliamentary Committees have since inquired into particular branches of the administration—into the finances and the department of public works—and their reports have tended to show that the mismanagement disclosed in the evidence they had collected could not be charged to individual action, but was the result of the existing system of government. It has thus become manifest that an inquiry into the working of that system must be made before any effectual remedy can be devised for the serious evils that have continued to depress our great dependency.

The system is based on two Acts of Parliament. Act 106 of 1858 vested in the Secretary of State all the powers which had previously been exercised by the East India Company and the Board of Control, with the proviso that, except on urgent occasions or in special cases requiring great secrecy, he shall consult the *Council of India* before passing any order, and be guided by its opinion in every case involving the expenditure of Indian revenue. Act 67 of 1861, constituting the Executive and Legislative Councils in India, maintained over them the control of the Secretary of State, giving him, as regards the latter Council, the power, in consultation with the *Council of India*, to disallow any law passed by the Indian Legislature. These Acts embody

the theory of our rule, but in practice an apparent compliance only has been maintained with their letter, while a departure from their spirit has to some extent neutralized the safeguards devised in them for securing good government, economy, and duly considered legislation.

The history of the last fifteen years records instances of Indian Secretaries of State having, under a literal interpretation of the Acts, omitted to consult the *Council of India* in cases where, by the spirit of those Acts, they were bound to consult it; supported the Governor-General in overruling his Council in ordinary matters, under a clause intended only for extraordinary cases of urgency; and, by directing definite pieces of legislation to be enacted by the Legislative Council, irrespective of the opinion entertained by that Council, deprived the Indian Legislature of its essential and most valuable attribute as a deliberative body. The Duke of Argyll's action in 1873, in sending, under the urgency clause, an order respecting a retirement scheme, and Lord Salisbury's action in the more recent matter of abolishing the duty on Manchester cottons, are cases in point. (See Parliamentary Papers, 248 and 236 of 1879.)

Such action has generally been taken either under pressure from Parliament or in furtherance of some Imperial policy pursued by the Cabinet to which the Indian Secretary belonged; and here it might perhaps not unreasonably be asked, how far a Secretary of State can be expected to risk the safety of his Cabinet, or even to disregard its political aims, in the defence of Indian interests for which he is accountable only to Parliament—that is, to the very authority by whom their sacrifice is required or sanctioned. In the answer to that question, however, lie the fate of our greatest dependency and the solution of problems touching the happiness of 200,000,000 of our fellow-subjects.

Action on the part of Secretaries of State, such as has been mentioned, led to protests of which the public seldom heard, and to the resignation of officials who declined to become instrumental in the execution of measures which they considered illegal and injurious. Other officials, however, were soon found willing to perform and defend the action desired by the Secretary of State; and the influence which they acquired by their services at these critical conjunctures appears often to have determined the Secretary of State's decisions in other matters, without, at the same time, entailing on those who exercised such influence the official responsibility which alone could have justified it; and thus has the actual control of the Indian administration been exercised by irresponsible advisers in super-

session of the *Council of India*, whom Parliament intended to be the constitutional and responsible advisers of the State.

In estimating the danger involved in this condition of things, it must, besides other considerations, be remembered that the executive power in India, while it is supported by the whole strength of the British Empire, is wielded by a handful of Englishmen, alien in material interests and race prejudices, as well as in religion and language, to the people over whom they rule, but with whom they hold no social intercourse whatever; while constitutional means for representing popular wants and feelings, such as exist in other civilized countries, and are deemed essential for the safe guidance of rulers, are denied to our Indian fellow-subjects.

In such circumstances it would, indeed, be a miracle if the Government found itself in unison with the feelings and interests of the governed, and it can, therefore, be no matter for wonder if, notwithstanding the long term of peace enjoyed in India, and the large amount of English capital embarked there in trade and railways, the material condition of her inhabitants over large tracts of the Empire should be declining, famine should be assuming greater virulence, the revenue should prove inelastic, and popular discontent should still be widespread, as it was ten years ago, when Lord Mayo so forcibly drew the attention of the Home authorities to the subject. These results have sprung from an anomalous system of administration, which may, in a great measure, be traced to the following causes:—

1. The Act of 1858, which created the *Council of India*, with the evident intention of affording to Indian interests, as opposed to English interests, the protection which they had previously received from the Court of Directors of the East India Company, failed to secure the due exercise of the very important functions which it assigned to that Council, its members being precluded from sitting in Parliament, its minutes being inaccessible to the public, and no means whatever being provided for vindicating its authority.

2. The Councils Act of 1861, while securing an official majority and giving the Secretary of State a power of veto, was, looking at the elaborate constitution of the Legislative Council, expressly devised for the purpose of insuring that the laws should be considered by a body removed from the sphere of English politics, and acquainted with the wants and feelings of the people of India. To use such machinery for giving the force of law to any measure which a Secretary of State, under the pressure of home politics and regardless of the opinion of the Legislative Council, might desire to see enacted, is flagrantly to violate the spirit of the said Act.

3. On the extinction of the East India Company, the centralization of power in a Secretary of State introduced in the motive influences of the administrative body in India an organic change which the Native population aptly characterised at the time by saying that "the Company's *rāj* (rule) had been replaced by *Naksha Ke rāj* " (rule by reports)." Accordingly, under the new *régime*, the supreme control being exercised by a Cabinet Minister more or less absorbed in the politics of Great Britain, lacking Indian experience, stationed thousands of miles from India, and able to judge of her administration only by the reports submitted to him, the advancement and promotion of Indian officials became, in a great measure, dependent on the impressions created by those reports; while the actual results of the administration, when unrecorded in the reports seen by the Secretary of State, remained unknown to him. This led to Indian officials devoting too much time and attention to writing reports, and too little to the actual work of administration; also, to important features in the reports of officers engaged in the immediate and practical duties of government being omitted in the compilations destined to meet the eye of the Secretary of State or the public.

Desk-work superseding the active duties of administration has often been the subject of remonstrance on the part of Provincial Governments, and the last Resolution of the Government of Bengal on the subject says: "As mentioned last year, the Lieutenant-Governor " will be glad if the Commissioner could so arrange his tour as to visit " more of the subdivisions within his jurisdiction. . . . The same " excuse as in past years is put forward on behalf of the district officer " of Alipore—pressure of work at head-quarters. The Lieutenant- " Governor has already said that he cannot accept this as sufficient."

The evil complained of is doubtless a very serious one, looking at the vast extent of the country and the small number of officers charged with its administration; at the same time, it seems vain to expect that it will yield to remonstrance, while its originating cause, so quaintly epitomised by the Natives, continues to be upheld. The evil has, in fact, extended to every department, and many millions are acknowledged to have been wasted, in consequence of superintending engineers being prevented by office-work from exercising due supervision over the construction of barracks and other public buildings.

II.

From these general considerations if we turn to particular features in the Indian administration, we find a number of extraordinary enactments passed of late years, all tending to increase the power and to

lessen the responsibility of the Executive. The Code of Criminal Procedure has been altered to enlarge the summary jurisdiction of stipendiary magistrates, and to discourage appeals from their decisions and from those of other Criminal Courts by sentences being made liable to enhancement on appeal. Moreover, the Government may appeal against an acquittal pronounced after a regular trial by a competent tribunal; and a sessions judge may ground his judgment upon evidence taken in a magistrate's court, although it is well known that such evidence is given under the influence and in the presence of the police interested in a conviction, and that threats or torture have frequently induced witnesses and accused persons to make such statements before the magistrate as the police desired.

The Code of Civil Procedure has likewise been altered, enabling the Executive to stay the execution of a decree of a Civil Court involving the sale of immovable property, by placing such property under the control of the District Collector and authorizing him to exercise over it all the powers of an owner; to retain its management if he believe that the decree might be liquidated from its income within a period not exceeding twenty years; or to raise money on it by mortgage, or sell portions of it, at his discretion. Furthermore, appeals from the District and Subordinate Courts to the High Courts of the Presidencies have been abolished in a large class of suits; a step, the significance and peculiar hardship of which will be understood when it is known that the former tribunals are presided over by officials who have had no legal training, and the latter by independent judges, who are trained lawyers and possess the full confidence of the people.

The initiation and enactment of these and numerous other similar measures did not proceed from the deliberations of the Legislative Council, but were manifestly imposed on that Council by the Executive. A reference to the debates on some of the measures in question may render this more clear.

In 1871-2 great difficulty began to be experienced in the collection of the land revenue in Bombay, owing to the excessive assessments which had recently been imposed. Thousands of farms were attached for arrears, and in some instances the landholders appealed in the Civil Courts against the new assessments, as being illegal. Thereupon the Government framed a Bill, which was subsequently passed as the *Bombay Revenue Jurisdiction Act*, removing all such cases from the cognizance of the Civil Courts, and leaving landholders to seek redress for illegal demands of Revenue officers at the hands of the Revenue authorities themselves. The member in charge of the Bill, in order to show the necessity of the measure, referred to a recent decree of:

the High Court, which invalidated a claim for land revenue on the ground that it contravened a Government regulation directing that no more than one-sixth of the gross produce can be imposed as the assessment on any field. The member made no attempt to justify the claim, but observed: "If every man be allowed to question in a court of law the incidence of the assessment on his field, the number of cases which might arise is likely to be overwhelming;" thus showing how widespread was the injustice which the Law Courts were thenceforth to be forbidden to redress. The Bill, nevertheless, was passed without serious comment, although there existed, and still exists, on the Statute-book of India another enactment on the same subject, based on principles diametrically opposed to those of the *Bombay Revenue Jurisdiction Act*, as the following extract from its preamble will show: "All questions between the Government and the landholders respecting the assessment of the public revenue have hitherto been cognizable in the Revenue Courts. The collectors of revenue preside in these courts as judges. The proprietors can never consider their rights as secure whilst the Revenue officers are vested with these judicial powers. It is obvious that if the regulations for assessing and collecting the public revenue are infringed, the Revenue officers themselves must be the aggressors, and that individuals who have been wronged by them in one capacity can never hope to obtain redress from them in another. Other security, therefore, must be given to landed property before improvements in agriculture can be effected. The Revenue officers must be deprived of their judicial powers; all financial claims of the Government, when disputed, must be submitted to the cognizance of Courts of Judicature superintended by judges who, from their official situations and the nature of their trusts, shall not only be uninterested in the result of their decisions, but bound to decide impartially between the Government and the landholders. The collectors of revenue must not only be divested of the power of deciding upon their own acts, but rendered amenable for them to the Courts of Judicature, and collect the public dues subject to a personal prosecution for every exaction exceeding the amount which they are authorized to demand, and for every deviation from the regulations prescribed for the collection of it."

The flourishing condition of Bengal, to which province this enactment applies, and the distress among the landholders of Bombay proclaim the results of the two measures.

Another instance of enactments being passed in obedience to the Executive was furnished by the proceedings of the Legislative

Council regarding two Land Bills for the North-western Provinces, in August, 1873, when the debate disclosed the remarkable fact that none of the members approved of the Bills, yet all voted for them. The President and the Financial Member urged nothing in support of the principles of the measures which they had met to enact, and the Military Member voted for them on trust. The Law Member confessed that "before drawing the Bills he had to divest "himself of those principles with which he had been familiar, and "that much of the matter was to him of great obscurity, complexity, "and uncertainty;" meaning, doubtless, that the measures violated those principles which, as a lawyer and an Englishman, he had been taught to uphold. The Member for Madras, after expressing doubts on the necessity and soundness of the measures, voted for them, as in duty bound, but added these ominous words: "I can "only express a hope that when these Bills become law, they "might prove an exception to our past experience in regard to "enactments affecting land tenures." The member in charge of the Bills, after supporting them by specious arguments only, manifested his antagonism to some of the most important principles involved in them by saying: "In reference to the peculiar powers "taken for officers engaged in the revision of settlements, I hope "to see the time when the revisions of the land revenue will not "occur with the same frequency as they now do, and that existing "settlements will be prolonged; or, if a certain enhancement of "revenue were deemed to be justified and necessary, that it might "be assessed upon some other procedure involving less of inquisition and interference with the agricultural classes than is inherent "in the present system." Lastly, the Members for Bengal and Bombay, the only other members who were present (the attendance of all non-official members having been prevented by the Council assembling at Agra), betrayed in forcible language their disapprobation of a number of the clauses; and it became manifest that the debate (or what had the semblance of a debate) was a delusion, and that the Bills had been shaped and were passed in obedience to orders received from the Secretary of State.

III.

The necessary limits of this paper preclude any lengthened description of the many recent enactments which disfigure the Statute-book of our Indian Empire, but a short reference to some of them, and to the circumstances under which they were passed, may suffice to show the very dangerous lines on which the Indian Legislature is proceeding:

In 1874 serious disturbances broke out in the Deccan, where the cultivators, forcibly entering the houses of the money-lenders to whom they were indebted, destroyed the records of their indebtedness. The land tax had recently been increased by upwards of 50 per cent.; and the cultivators, finding themselves unable to satisfy the enhanced demand, applied for loans to the Saökârs, their bankers. The latter, however, perceiving that the increased tax must soon ruin the cultivators, not only refused to advance further capital, but called for the settlement of their existing claims. The ryots, thus pressed by the simultaneous and peremptory demands of the Collector and the Saökâr, and driven to despair in their destitute condition, attacked the weaker of their two antagonists in the manner just mentioned. With the aid of troops, however, order was soon restored; and, of the 951 persons arrested on the occasion, 501 were convicted and punished. The people then earnestly begged for an inquiry into the state of things which had led to the disturbances; and after some delay a Commission was appointed, and sufficient evidence for arriving at a conclusion was collected by the 8th of November, 1875, as shown by the Minute of one of the members. The Report, however, appeared only late in 1878 (Parliamentary Paper C, 2071 of 1878), when public attention had been diverted from the subject and was engrossed by the incidents of the Afghan War.

This Report, tracing events from an early period, states that "the over-estimate of the Deccan, formed and acted upon by our early Collectors, drained the country of its agricultural capital, and accounts for the poverty and distress in which the cultivating classes were plunged until about 1850" (paragraph 33); that the assessments having been left undisturbed for thirty years, the country gradually recovered, and cultivation was extended until "all the culturable land was brought under the plough, population and agricultural capital of all kinds increased steadily" (paragraph 35), and "in 1862 began a period of extraordinary prosperity, caused by the rise in the price of cotton;". . . that on the 26th of July, 1864, the Government of Bombay wrote: "There never was a time during the known history of Western India when land suitable for the growth of grain was in greater demand. . . . It may be said with almost literal truth that not a thousand acres of land which had been cultivated during the memory of man are now to be found uncultivated in the Deccan and the Konkan" (paragraph 66); that the land settlements were revised and enhanced in the years 1869 to 1872, the increase being from Rs. 3,95,419 to Rs. 6,10,251 in the five subdivisions stated as an illustration (paragraph 69); that the enhanced demand could scarcely

be collected; that "from 1870 to 1874 there was a marked increase "in the difficulty of collecting the land revenue" (paragraph 72), and that "at the same time the area of cultivation contracted" (paragraph 73).

The Report thus clearly indicates how the excessive pressure of the land tax originally imposed kept the peasantry in poverty and distress for a long time; how subsequent fixity in the Government demand on land encouraged the extension of cultivation and resulted in a great degree of prosperity, and how that period of prosperity came to an end on the imposition of an excessive land tax.

It also appears from the Report that Revenue officers, whose letters are quoted in it, warned the authorities in earnest language of the danger involved in the sudden and large increase which was being made in the land tax. The delay in producing the Report, and the suggestion introduced into it, to the effect that the recent impoverishment of the peasantry had no connection with the pressure of the enhanced assessments, but proceeded from other causes, become therefore intelligible as means of concealing the fatal error which the Government had committed. The causes suggested for that impoverishment, at paragraph 67 of the Report, are "unproductive soil, precarious climate, ignorance, improvidence, defective law, expansion of credit," &c. But as those causes had been in operation all along, and yet not hindered the growth of prosperity and its continuance for ten years, they will not suffice to account for its sudden cessation, the obvious and immediate cause of which was the excessive burden suddenly imposed upon the land. Such, at all events, would appear to have been the opinion of members of the Commission, who presented separate Minutes dissenting from particular conclusions stated in the Report. Mr. (now Sir) Auckland Colvin, one of those members, protested in the following terms against the peculiar suggestion in the Report that has just been mentioned: "It seems to me, in the face of such considerations, quite unreasonable to urge that the revision of the survey had nothing to do with the present crisis," and reviewing the evidence collected by the Commission, he says: "These considerations justify me in placing the excessive enhancement of the recent settlements among the special causes which have combined to disturb the relations of debtor and creditor in the Poona and adjoining districts."

The Government, however, ignored these conclusions of Sir Auckland Colvin, and based its enactment for the relief of the distress reported by the Commission on the assumption that such distress had proceeded chiefly from the ignorance and improvidence of the

ryots, and the rapacity and dishonesty of the money-lenders. There is no wonder, therefore, in the enactment having broken down after trial; and the following remarks of Justice West, of the High Court of Bombay, for whose opinion an Amendment Bill was submitted last summer, will give some idea of the serious errors to which an Executive is liable when exercising legislative powers uncontrolled :—

“(1.) The Bombay Government has found difficulties in working ‘the *Deccan Agriculturists’ Relief Act*, for the removal of which it appears necessary to make certain amendments. If central principles are wrong, no mere adaptation of subordinate means can repair the defect. . . (2.) At present, if I am rightly informed, the interchange of capital between the moneyed class and the landholders is almost brought to a standstill, owing to the uncertainty of the landholder being able to enforce his rights. Give a wide uncertain margin to the class of agriculturists, by making it dependent (as proposed in the Amendment Bill) on the varying policy or predilections of the Executive, and the existing paralysis will creep over another quarter of the social body. . . (4.) The proposal to qualify the Police Patel for the office of conciliator is highly objectionable. The Patels are almost all illiterate; they are for the most part in debt, have generally extensive local connections, and exercise formidable influence through their police jurisdiction. . . (7.) Under section 71 and its retrospective declarations, a mass of rights arising from the legal precedence of conflicting instruments has already come into existence. What is to be done with these rights? Are people who have recently bought or taken mortgages on the faith of there being no claims superior to those they were acquiring, to be postponed to any holder of any instrument to be marked under the proposed amendment? Section 71 is harsh and embarrassing, but the proposed amendment would produce endless confusion and litigation. . . (9.) The Act which it is proposed to amend has been in operation for a year and half. There has been time to judge, in some respects, how far its results correspond with the sanguine expectations with which it was launched. ‘The problem before us,’ it was said, ‘is how to keep the money-lender in his place, to encourage and support him in all useful functions. . . We must foster credit. . . We must hold the ryot responsible for what he has borrowed . . . not set him free by one-sided remedies.’ Now, unless the general opinion is wholly mistaken, the most conspicuous consequence of the Act has been to oust the money-lender from his place, by means of a one-sided remedy, which has extinguished credit by making the ryot irresponsible. The whole class of those who

“ furnished capital to the cultivators have, with very few exceptions,
 “ closed their business. . . . (11.) The Courts are not merely invited
 “ to do injustice, they are compelled to do it. . . . (26.) Under
 “ the Act the Saökâr cannot lend Rs. 8 without an acknowledg-
 “ ment requiring registration perhaps several miles off. . . . (27.)
 “ The lumbering process of registration for every petty loan of
 “ a retail banker is quite inconsistent with the free and rapid
 “ circulation which makes a small capital perform the work of a large
 “ one. . . . (28.) Placed at such disadvantage in the Courts when
 “ suing to recover loans, the Saökârs have, in many instances, bought
 “ the property of cultivators instead of lending on it. Every transac-
 “ tion of this kind induced by the Act has been a defeat of its avowed
 “ purpose. It was not the object of the Legislature ‘ to convert
 “ ‘ yeomen into pauper labourers. . . . to such a peasantry expropria-
 “ ‘ tion means discouragement, despair, and exasperation ; ’ and yet
 “ expropriation is their unavoidable lot unless capital (on reasonable
 “ terms) is within their reach. . . . (30.) If the objections regarding
 “ the Act, not by speculative theorists, but by people personally
 “ acquainted with its working, rest, as may fairly be assumed, on a
 “ foundation of fact, the best amendment of the Act would consist in
 “ its total and immediate repeal. . . . Experience has too little been
 “ relied on; good intentions have been assumed as a sufficient justifica-
 “ tion of a policy of social revolution. There is everywhere manifest
 “ a want of insight into the larger conditions of human conduct and
 “ action. . . . Before new interests have grown up under the Act, to
 “ be the grounds of new complaints in the event of any change, it
 “ seems desirable that there should be a searching and impartial
 “ inquiry into the working of the measure, by men of independent
 “ character, and, as far as possible, by people not employed by the
 “ Government or committed to its policy.

“ RAYMOND WEST.

“ High Court, Bombay, July 23rd, 1881.”

Such is the opinion given under official responsibility by a judge of
 the Appellate Court, presiding over the tribunals which are charged
 with the working of the Act. It is partly founded on, and generally
 agrees with, the reports submitted by the subordinate judges. And
 what has been the course of action adopted by the Government with
 regard to it? Justice West's condemnation of the Act and the
 Amendment Bill was pronounced in terms so unqualified, that to have
 acquiesced in his legal opinion would have amounted to an admis-
 sion of unfitness in the Indian Government for the legislative func-
 tions it had exercised. The Judge's Minute was, therefore, ignored ;

the Amendment Bill, somewhat altered, was passed through the Bombay Council, and forwarded to the Legislative Council of India, and we now hear of its having become law.

Can any doubt be entertained as to the disastrous results which must ensue from a course so clearly shown to be unsound and dangerous? Reasoning, however, would be of no avail, since the Government are obviously acting not from conviction, but in defence of a course previously adopted; and public opinion has seldom been expressed with sufficient power upon questions of Indian administration to interfere materially with any course of action which the Indian Government may have determined on following. Experimental legislation has thus been greatly encouraged, and two more land laws are at present in progress affecting other parts of the country.

The *Bengal and Behar Rent Bills*, submitted in 1880 for the sanction of the Secretary of State, were, it is true, shelved on account of certain defects, and chiefly, it is said, because no necessity had been shown for legislation on the most important points in the Bills. The officials in India, however, have recast their measures, and seem confident of ultimate success. The professed object of legislation in this instance was to aid landowners in recovering their rents, the Government having charged them to collect, at the same time, that portion of the new cesses on land which is payable by the tenant. This object, however, would appear to have been lost sight of, since the provisions of the two Bills in question, far from lessening the difficulties of collecting rent, were calculated, on the contrary, greatly to increase them; and the chief effect of the measures would have been to transfer certain proprietary rights of landowners to their tenants. That no necessity exists for such interference with the rights of property may at once be seen from the condition of the ryots in the permanently settled districts, to which alone the Bills were intended to apply, their condition having for years been represented in the Administration Reports as exceptionally prosperous, and as progressive.

Had the intention been generally to protect tenants against the undue enhancement of rents, the Bills would have been made applicable to all parts, especially to those where the cultivating farmers were known to be in greatest distress. But the proposed benefits were to be conferred only on the comparatively prosperous tenantry of the permanently settled tracts, while in the other districts of the same provinces of Bengal and Behar landlords were to be allowed to raise their rents, uninterfered with by the provisions of the Bills, evidently in order that they might collect sufficient additional rents to discharge

any increased land tax which the Government might hereafter impose on their estates. This would indicate that the intention of the proposed enactment, in endowing tenants with rights pertaining to their landlords, was most probably to appropriate the value of such rights, by afterwards imposing on the tenants thus enriched, taxation which the Covenant of 1793 prevents the Government from imposing on the landowners.

Much alarm and excitement were caused in India by the publication of the Bills in 1880, and great relief was consequently afforded by the subsequent news of the measures having been shelved at the India Office. The public mind, however, was soon unsettled again by the reappearance of the Bills in a new form ; for experience has shown that "*much is in the power of an all-embracing bureaucracy, with the press in its hands, and a Government at its back, which may any day be at its wits' end for money, and which can hardly undertake an object on which it has set its heart without a cess on the land.*" (Parliamentary Paper C, 3086, December 1st, 1881, page 142 : Minute by Sir Louis Mallet.)

IV.

The statements contained in the foregoing pages, and which all rest upon authentic testimony, show that the failure of the system under which India has been governed since 1858 has been due to the inadequacy of the means which were then devised for the protection of her revenues, and for the wholesome control of the extensive powers vested in the Secretary of State. The moral influence of the *Council of India* seems to have been all that was relied upon for the fulfilment of those essential conditions, and failure under such circumstances can, therefore, be no matter for wonder. The question which now presses for a solution is how to remedy an evil which has already assumed large proportions ; how to secure a more economical administration of the finances of India, and greater consideration in her Legislature for the wants and feelings of her inhabitants.

Merely to rectify the error which left the *Council of India* without the means of performing its important functions would be of little avail, seeing that a greater error still was committed when the duty of protecting Indian interests was assigned to a body holding no stake in the country, and ill-suited, by the position of its members as Government servants, to assert the degree of independence necessary for the protection of the vast interests confided to its care. What is obviously needed is the influence of a body intimately acquainted with the wants, feelings, and opinions of the people of India ; and, at the same time, deeply and personally interested in their well-being. The

members of such a body should be men who could unhesitatingly be accepted as representatives of the people—a condition which is not fulfilled even by the members of the Legislative Council in India. The Councils Act secures an official majority under all circumstances, by allowing the Government to reduce the number of non-official members to three. Such members, moreover, being appointed by the Government for a limited period, and re-elected only at its pleasure, cannot be expected to assert, in the expression of their opinions, the degree of independence essential to the discharge of their duties. Furthermore, the power of making rules for the conduct of business in the Legislative Council being vested, not in the Council, but in the Government, the presence of non-official members may be dispensed with on any occasion when a measure has to be passed to which they are opposed, simply by the Council being held on such occasion at Simla, where non-official members cannot attend.

Legislation enacted under similar conditions has necessarily failed to be in harmony with the wants and feelings of the people, and resulted frequently in unforeseen complications and difficulties, as in the case of the *Deccan Agriculturists' Relief Act*.

These considerations lead to the conclusion that a remedy for some of the most serious errors committed in 1858 might be found in a reorganization of the Legislative Council, such as would prepare the way for introducing in it a true and substantial representation of the people for whom that Council has to legislate, and would render it impossible for its decisions to be dictated by the Executive, as at present. In short, the successful administration of India seems to require a reasonable amount of self-government and a corresponding modification in the all-absorbing power now centered in an authority stationed thousands of miles from India, unacquainted with the country and its inhabitants, and subject to the influences of a Cabinet and a Parliament whose interests are frequently at variance with those of India.

The present Viceroy, after a year's experience, has himself come to a similar conclusion, as may be seen from the following passages in a Resolution of the Governor-General in Council, dated Sept. 30th, 1881, regarding a financial scheme shortly to be initiated: "A very important question is intimately connected with the scheme for the decentralization of finance—namely, the development of self-government. Allusion was prominently made to this point in the Resolution of December 14th, 1870, in the following terms: "Beyond all this there is a greater and wider object in view. The operation of this Resolution will afford opportunities for developing self-

“*government.*” The Governor-General is of opinion that the time “has arrived when further practical development may be afforded to “the intentions of Lord Mayo’s Government, and that the provincial “agreements should no longer ignore the question of local self- “government. His Excellency would, therefore, invite the Pro- “vincial Governments to ascertain what measures are necessary “to insure more local self-government . . . and consider ways of “equalizing local taxation, checking severe and unsuitable imposts, “and favouring forms most in accordance with popular opinion and “sentiment.”

Moreover, the letter of October 10th, 1881, transmitting the above Resolution to the Government of Bengal, observes: “It would be “hopeless to expect any real development of self-government if local “bodies were subject to check and interference in matters of detail. “ . . . The Government of India is confident that the Lieutenant- “Governor fully appreciates the importance of the extension of local “self-government . . . and that no efforts will be spared to insure “the success of a scheme which will tend to reconcile the public “to the burden of local taxation, and lead to the more extensive “employment of the Natives of India in the administration of public “affairs, while conferring on them higher powers of control over all “expenditure on objects of local importance.”

Nothing could more clearly express Lord Ripon’s conviction that it is through self-government that the administration of India can be improved; and a reference in the Resolution shows that Lord Mayo had arrived at precisely the same conclusion eleven years ago. The same idea must also have prevailed in Parliament when the admission of non-official members in the Legislative Council was decided upon twenty years ago; and yet, to this day, self-government has not been introduced in any part of India! Its outward form appears in the Legislative Council; but it is a hollow form, rendered unsubstantial by the devices explained in a preceding page; and somewhat similar devices have produced the same results in the municipalities and district committees. The members of those bodies are, as a rule, appointed by the Executive, not elected by the people; and, as their chairmen or presidents are stipendiary magistrates whose powers have recently been increased through extraordinary alterations in the Codes of Civil and Criminal Procedure, non-official members are deterred by well-founded considerations of prudence from expressing opinions distasteful to the chairmen or presidents.

Under such circumstances the Viceroy’s injunction to “check

"unsuitable imposts and favour forms most in accordance with "popular opinion and sentiment," must remain a dead-letter, seeing that, by the retention of magistrates as chairmen, the Government has adopted the most effectual means for preventing the expression of "popular opinion and sentiment." The same cause must also neutralize any advance towards self-government which popular elections (to the extension of which Lord Ripon is favourable) would otherwise promote. These inconsistencies would appear to have obscured the real intention of the Resolution; for one seeks in vain, in the Circular issued on the subject by the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, dated November 4th, 1881, for any suggestion likely to promote the development of self-government; while several passages in it are calculated, on the contrary, to aggravate the existing conditions which are inimical to self-government.

Under all these circumstances Lord Ripon's scheme, as far as self-government is concerned, appears destined to failure; and when it is remembered how many pledges given since the Royal Proclamation of 1858, and how many promises made to the people of India, have remained unredeemed and unfulfilled, their growing mistrust in the good intentions of their rulers will easily be understood and almost seem justified.

Twelve years ago Lord Mayo said, with reference to the Budget submitted in March, 1870: "An accumulated deficit of six millions "has occurred in the last three years; the permanent debt during the "same period has been increased by six and a half millions; the serious "and unprecedented course of increasing the burdens of the people in "the middle of the year has been taken; the public works have in a "great measure been suspended; the income tax and the salt tax in "Madras and Bombay have been increased; the Government has "declined to terrify the people by new taxes, and has endeavoured to "extricate the Empire from a very great difficulty by the only mode "which it thought it could venture to adopt; the period has been one "of great trouble to the Empire and of anxiety to the Government." These statements, and the remarkable despatch from which an extract was given at the commencement of this paper, obtained some respite for the taxpayers in India; but in 1877 increased taxation was resorted to with renewed severity, although famine was meanwhile devastating large tracts of country; crime increased to an alarming degree, as shown in the official statistics, and millions of acres of land were thrown out of cultivation.

The additional revenue, obtained through so much suffering to the people, failed, however, to cover the increasing expenditure of the

State, and fresh loans had to be contracted, which imposed permanent burdens on the country, while the financial embarrassments of the Government have continued to this day, as evidenced by the necessity which has compelled the retention of taxes known to be excessively oppressive and unpopular, such as the salt tax in Madras and Bombay, and the license tax in Bengal and the North-west Provinces.

The fatal effects of an excessive duty on salt—an article essential to health and invaluable to agriculture and manufactures—have repeatedly been exposed by public writers and in Parliamentary debates; and, although a reduction of 20 per cent. is now declared, the tax will still be higher than it was in 1870, after Lord Mayo's Government had increased it under great financial embarrassments, and will amount to 1,000 per cent. on the primitive value of the article, salt being produced in the Madras and Bombay Presidencies for Rs. 20 the 100 maunds, while a tax of Rs. 200 will now be levied on that quantity before it is allowed to pass into consumption. Then as regards the license tax, it has been condemned in unqualified terms by the very authorities who have been charged with its assessment and collection. The Hon. Sir Ashley Eden, Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, in reviewing the administration of that tax, recently recorded the following opinion: "*The whole of the proceedings connected with the working of the license tax show how impossible it is to effect a proper assessment and collection of a direct tax like the license tax. The machinery for the honest and conscientious working of such a tax cannot be secured in this country, and it is for this reason that the Lieutenant-Governor has deprecated direct taxation.*" What, then, must be the real condition of the finances of India, when the Government are under the necessity of imposing on her people not only the oppressive burden of the salt duty in Madras and Bombay, but the universally condemned license tax, which, while it barely produces half a million, cannot, confessedly, be realized without a resort to dishonest and unscrupulous means?

V.

The development of local self-government, which Lord Ripon has so strongly expressed a desire to promote, would be greatly facilitated by consistent adherence to the course initiated some years ago, when the municipalities of the Presidency and of other towns in India were partly elected by the ratepayers. The working of that measure has been satisfactorily reported upon by the authorities, and it was to have been extended to all the larger towns of the Empire; but such extension has been arrested by adverse influences, and a petition from Poona (the capital of the Deccan and the seat of the Bombay Govern-

ment during a portion of the year), praying for the introduction of the elective system in its municipality, appears to have been rejected without any reason being assigned for the refusal.

Adverse influences like those just alluded to must be counteracted, and the municipalities must be left to elect their chairmen, before success can be looked for from the endeavours of the present Viceroy to give India the inestimable benefits of local self-government. The principle could then be advantageously applied to the Legislative Council, by the election of its non-official members being entrusted to the popularly elected municipalities—that is, to a body of men who would possess the confidence of a large and important section of their countrymen. The Council, at the same time, should be interdicted from legislating at a distance from the metropolis, and from, in any way, preventing non-official members from taking part in its deliberations.

It is obvious that, without such measures of common fairness, the present attempt to develop self-government in the administration of India must, from the causes already indicated, prove as unsuccessful as were those which Parliament made in 1861, and Lord Mayo's Government in 1870; while the disappointment which would ensue from the frustration of the hopes which are now being raised among the Indian populations could not fail to embitter their feelings, and to further diminish their confidence in the good intentions of their rulers.

Enough has, doubtless, been said to show how urgent is the necessity for reform in our Indian Administration; and the above-mentioned Resolutions of Lord Mayo's Government and of the present Governor-General in Council have clearly indicated the direction in which a remedy for the deficiencies of the present system should be sought—namely, in the development of self-government. But by whom is this reform to be initiated? The Indian Secretary of State's tenure of office is precarious, and the influences to which he is subject seem to place the task beyond his scope of action. Besides, an Indian Secretary, with every desire to improve the administration, and with all the power vested in him, cannot effect any permanent amelioration, as the following passage in Lord Salisbury's Minute of April 29th, 1875, so tersely expresses: "We have not the power to give permanent force to a new policy. Can we enact that our successors shall do that which we are not doing—forbear from altering their predecessors' work?"

Then as regards Parliament, its duties to its constituents prevent it from exercising, except under the pressure of public opinion, the impartiality needed for the due performance of the task; while it

would be hopeless to expect the Indian Government sincerely to initiate a movement intended to curtail and control its own power.

Great reforms have, as a rule, sprung from popular movement. Must we, then, wait until such movement in India has acquired sufficient strength to compel reform? The time for a similar conjuncture may be distant, or it may perhaps be at hand. In either case the latent forces now at work may have assumed a power which would render it difficult, if not impossible, to direct the movement when it occurs; and concessions to popular excitement might then have to be made which would prove inconsistent alike with the permanent interests of the people, and with those of their rulers.

The only chance of a favourable solution seems to lie in the development of public opinion at home, to whose influence Parliament and the Government must both yield. But the people of England have yet to be informed on the bearings of the present question, and even on the vastness and importance of their own stake in India. Any great disaster in that country would inevitably bring sorrow and distress to thousands of families in the United Kingdom. Those who strive, therefore, to place the requisite information before the public at home, labour in the interests of the people of this country, as well as for the welfare of the millions in India.

The CHAIRMAN said that all present would feel indebted to Mr. Dacosta for the able paper to which they had listened with so much evident interest. The concluding remarks of the paper, he thought, must have come home to them all as words of the utmost importance—viz., that more attention should be excited among the English people in regard to the affairs of India. Now, in the early part of the paper, it was remarked that Englishmen in India are an alien race. That was perfectly true, and he (the Chairman) was afraid that, to a certain extent, Englishmen were more alien now than they were seventy or eighty years ago. For this there were two reasons. In the first place, in the early part of the century, an Englishman going out to India, looked on it as his permanent home, or, at least, as the place in which a large part of his life would be passed. To such an extent was this the case, that he lost interest in English affairs, and became quite absorbed in Indian questions. It was then, he believed, common to find a man who had spent thirty or forty years, or even more, in India. He (the Chairman) remembered that when he was quite a young man, he met in Constantinople an old Colonel who had been forty-three years in India, and had not been home to England for thirty-seven years.

Well, that was the class of men to be found in India a few years ago ; but now, with the improved facilities of communication by the overland route, men were brought to England every three or four years. Although this is an advantage, it would seem that Englishmen do not get the same permanent interest in the people, the same familiarity with the language and usages of the Natives, as did their predecessors. It was true, there might be countervailing advantages. We get, for instance, in this country many Natives of India who thus have an opportunity of learning more of the English nation than they could do in India. But we must bear in mind, it is only the upper classes of India who can afford to come to England ; the millions of the poorer classes must permanently remain in India. And if, as he feared, Englishmen in India have not the same knowledge of the habits, feelings, and thoughts of the Natives as their predecessors had, that circumstance in itself was of considerable importance. Then another change had arisen from the great alteration in the government of India which took place, to some extent, in 1854, and permanently in 1858. He referred to the abolition of the East India Company. He was one of those who thought the East India Company never had sufficient justice done to it ; at all events, there were certain things in connection with the Company which were of great advantage to the people of India. Although the Directors of the East India Company might have included some men who got into the position through canvassing, and not on account of any claim they possessed to govern India, on the whole, the great body of Directors were men who had spent their lives in India—men who, having become very familiar with the people of India, looked forward to returning home to spend the remainder of their days in the government of the people of India, to the extent to which it was open to them by the East India Company's directorate. These Directors, he apprehended, had far more power as regarded the internal economy of India than was possessed by their successors, the Council of India. Secretaries of State, it was true, interfered then, as they do now, in such matters as frontier politics. The first Afghan War was the result of the action of Lord Broughton, in the same way as the more recent war in Afghanistan was the doing of Lord Salisbury. But, with regard to internal government of the country, if we compare the days of Sir J. K. Hobhouse with the days of Lord Hartington, we shall find that the old East India Directors had a great deal more power and scope in the management of details of administration than the Indian Council have at this moment. (Hear, hear.) Then there was another advantage of the East India Company. That was that the Court of

Proprietors, though they had no power, was a body of gentlemen acquainted with Indian questions, and debated them. These debates appeared in the papers; and thus Indian matters were constantly brought under the notice of the public. Only a few men, comparatively, could become Directors, but many men were in the position to make an investment in East India Stock, to qualify them for attendance at the Court meetings, where they were able to give expression to their views. The East India Company was succeeded by the Council of the Secretary of State for India; but, as far as he (Alderman Fowler) could gather, this Council, in this the twenty-third year of its existence, was becoming more and more of a cipher. (Hear, hear.) It is true, it is composed of eminent men like Sir William Muir—men who had spent their lives in India, and knowing India as well as any living Englishman. But, it would be recollected, the Indian Council's original constitution was that half of its members were appointed by the Secretary of State, and the other half were self-elected. Originally, too, the Council was composed of men who had obtained experience as Directors of the East India Company. Now the Council is composed entirely of nominees of the Secretary of State, and their term of office is limited. This was not originally the case; and he (the Chairman) was inclined to regard it as a good thing, for the reason that it would secure a succession of men with recent experience of India, instead of men whose knowledge of the country had got rusty with age, so to speak. But, on the other hand, the limited duration of office on the Council must tend to increase the power of the Secretary of State. Therefore, as far as the Home Government was concerned, the effect was that the whole administration of India fell into the hands of the Secretary of State. (Hear, hear.) It appeared to him that the only function of the Council was that its members might state their views, and, being in constant contact with the Secretary of State, might influence him. The reason given for the abolition of the old Company, he remembered, was that India would be brought directly under the control of the House of Commons. He thought it could be proved that if the House of Commons in those days (the days of the Company) chose to interfere in Indian questions, they had the power to do so. He recollected hearing Mr. Gladstone use—he thought it was in 1872—the precise argument about the opium trade which Sir Robert Peel had used in the days of the Company, thirty years before—viz., that the House of Commons had no right to interfere. He (the speaker) did not think that argument could be maintained, but he quoted it as having been advanced by the present

Prime Minister. It might be considered presumptuous of him (the Chairman) to dispute the matter, but he remarked that there are authorities who hold that, as an ultimate appeal, the House of Commons must be consulted. But when they looked at the House of Commons, and considered of what it is composed, it would be admitted that now it is less likely than ever to be competent to deal with Indian matters. The number of men in the House understanding Indian questions had never been large, and he was afraid it was getting smaller. (Hear, hear.) One of these gentlemen, who had shown himself to be of the greatest value in the House of Commons, had, unfortunately, lost his seat, and was not likely to go back again. He referred to his friend, Sir Charles Wingfield—a man of great Indian experience and knowledge, who always looked on questions with a sincere desire to do justice to the people of India; one of the very best specimens of Indian statesmen that had ever been seen in the House of Commons. As he said, Sir Charles Wingfield had, unfortunately, lost his seat. But the House of Commons, if it contains comparatively few men of actual personal experience on the subject, does at least include many who give, and have given, great and useful attention to it; and among the most distinguished of these was his friend, Mr. Fawcett. Mr. Fawcett, he remembered, said on one occasion (and he quite sympathized with the expression) that there was no responsibility which he felt pressed so heavily upon him as that which he owed to the people of India. But as regards Mr. Fawcett, a highly honourable and most deserved distinction had been conferred upon him in the way of office in connection with the present Ministry, and probably there was no man regarding whom the House of Commons, irrespective of party, would be so unanimous in anticipating that he would ably discharge the duties of his office, and do good service to his country. But with Mr. Fawcett in his office as Postmaster-General, the management of a very important department must have his constant attention, and its many details must pre-occupy him, so that it is quite impossible for him to give the same place in his mind to the affairs of India as they held when the cares of office did not absorb him, and he was only a private member. In addition to that, it is not usual for one member of Her Majesty's Government to interfere with the business of a Department in charge of a colleague. It is true that while the number of men in the House of Commons who can speak with authority upon Indian subjects are very few, there are other members, like himself, who endeavour to learn what they can of Indian affairs, and who bring their best judgment upon them as they arise. But they feel that they are only

learners as regards India ; they have to learn from others who are competent to give decided opinions, and therefore their own views could not be expected to be of very great value. As regards the great mass of the House of Commons, he was sorry to say that their attitude—the attitude of nine out of ten members—was indicated in the remark, “ I know nothing of India, and when the debate comes on I “ leave it to those who know Indian affairs to carry it on ; and there-
“ fore I don’t go down to the House.” (Hear, hear.) It is apparent, therefore, that the House of Commons cannot be a very satisfactory arena for the discussion of Indian subjects. These are the difficulties with which we are confronted. At the same time, I certainly do very much regret that no Committee of the House of Commons has been appointed to deal with Indian questions. As Mr. Dacosta points out, they are now left to be dealt with by a Cabinet Minister ; whereas a Committee on Indian questions would be an advantage in every way, and would enable those who take an interest in India to examine competent witnesses and acquire reliable general information on the operations of the Indian Government. Mr. Dacosta pointed out that no House of Commons’ Committee has sat since the year 1858. In the days of the East India Company the Charter came up for renewal every twenty years ; and prior to that renewal a Committee of Inquiry was always appointed, composed of the leading members of the House of Commons, two or three Cabinet Ministers, and the front Opposition,—a Committee of all parties. Thus the Committee of 1852, created with a view to the renewal of the Charter in 1854, was presided over by Mr. Thomas Baring, and included among its members Mr. Gladstone, the present Lord Derby, Lord John Russell (leader of the Opposition), and Mr. Disraeli, and others of similar eminence. Since 1858 no Committee of similar authority has been appointed. Mr. Fawcett, indeed, succeeded in inducing Mr. Gladstone, during his first Ministry, to appoint a very useful Committee upon Indian Finance, and it included some distinguished members of Parliament ; but its object was limited. In circumstances like these they must all feel that meetings like those held by the East India Association, when able papers were submitted by those who have given the several subjects their special study, are of great value in calling public attention in this country to the affairs of India. (Hear, hear.) He would not dilate further on the subject, for if one began to discuss Indian questions, one might go on indefinitely,—questions, for instance, like the import duties on cotton, now entirely abolished. In regard to that one topic, however, he would say, in passing, that he certainly thought the present Government had left to them no other course than to

sweep the duties away, as the inevitable result of the action of Lord Salisbury in the previous Administration. He regretted the course which Lord Salisbury then took, because he thought his Lordship was guided and influenced by an agitation of the Lancashire members of Parliament, and that the interests of Lancashire were allowed too large a place in the question. (Hear, hear.) In point of fact, the matter had been looked at by both parties in the State as more a necessity of home political tactics than an interest of the people of India. And this is just a specimen of how Indian questions are likely to be made the sport of the political parties in England and their strategists. He knew that there were many gentlemen in the meeting who would be able to address them from the resources of their own personal experience in Indian affairs, and therefore he would detain them no longer than to say that he was sure he was giving expression to the general feeling in thanking Mr. Dacosta for his very able and interesting paper. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. W. MARTIN WOOD said he would have preferred that some other member should have first spoken on the various special points raised by Mr. Dacosta. Still, upon the main question he would venture to say that upon a subject of such peculiar importance and urgency a more practical and precise treatment was needed than had been furnished by Mr. Dacosta. He meant the question—"By whom is India Governed?" (Hear, hear.) Briefly speaking, it might be said that India is governed by the Secretary of State "in Council;" whereas Mr. Dacosta sought to show that it is really governed by a Secretary of State without a Council. (Hear, hear.) This main issue had been discussed too briefly in the paper, for it is only in Part I. and in portions of Parts IV. and V. that the essential question is really dealt with. That portion of Mr. Dacosta's paper which avers that "the actual control of the Indian administration has been exercised by irresponsible advisers, in supersession of the Council of India," raises a constitutional question of the gravest character, and forcibly shows the necessity of considering the means by which a high executive officer—the man by whom India is governed—can be controlled and encroachments resisted. One remedy, he thought, would be the summary one of prompt and full publicity being given to the deliberations of the Indian Council. (Hear, hear.) The Minutes of the Council are now, in effect, secret. One of the most practical reforms would be the production of the proceedings of the Indian Council, once a month or so, on the table of the House of Commons. Those

who desired to consider further the advantages of publicity he would refer to a paper of his own, read at Bombay, published in the Eighth Volume of the proceedings of the Association. But that only referred to one branch of the subject. With regard to the Secretary of State's overruling the Council, it must be remembered that that has been done by both parties in the State. The action of the Duke of Argyll had been cited by Mr. Dacosta, and there were other similar instances; but his Grace's action was not nearly so grave as the utter overruling and ignoring of the Council in the proceedings which led up to the Afghan War. In this, beyond a doubt, if such a Committee of the House of Commons as the Chairman described were even now appointed, serious exposure would be the result of an inquiry into the proceedings of the period. He need hardly recall how the earlier encroachments, to which he had referred, were met with firm constitutional resistance from Sir Erskine Perry; nor how Sir Henry Maine weakly yielded, and found reasons for excusing the Secretary of State's aggression upon the rights of the Council. All these episodes require exposition, founded on such Parliamentary papers as can be obtained; and seeing we have two members of Parliament present on the platform, he trusted they would assist the Association to promote inquiry in this direction. Discussions on the subject of the present paper have repeatedly been held by the East India Association. He would refer to a paper by one of the members of the Bombay Branch, Mr. Javerilal Umiashankar, which would be found in the Volume for 1874, under the title of "Bureaucracy in India." Another, in 1872, on "The Representation of India in Parliament," was opened in London by Mr. I. T. Pritchard, and was continued during two or three sittings of the Association; and others have been given at the instance of Sir Bartle Frere, Sir David Wedderburn, Mr. William Tayler, and Mr. Routledge. He mentioned this to remind the members and others that in the Journal of the Association there is an immense mass of information on this, as upon most other topics of vital importance to India. (Hear, hear.) The latter portion of Mr. Dacosta's paper dealt with the difficult and complicated question of the representation in India. This, nevertheless, has always been the more popular question, and that branch of the subject is more fully treated by the authors and speakers whom he had last mentioned. Here he would remark that it must always be remembered that the question of representation in India is not one that can be settled in a European sense by enfranchising the masses. To get any legislative representation of the masses,—of the artisans, cultivators, and labourers,—

is impracticable. Thus there is that check upon all schemes for popular representation in India, that the literary, clerkly, trading, and wealthy classes will hugely preponderate in any elective system that can be worked. Hence there is the greater responsibility laid upon us in England and India for seeing that the interests of the masses of the people are fairly cared for. Turning to the two principal illustrations used by Mr. Dacosta, he might venture to question the appositeness of one and the suitability of the other. The first, that of the Bombay Revenue Jurisdiction Bill, was apposite enough at the time; but all that Mr. Dacosta said was anticipated in Mr. W. Tayler's paper (see Part 2, Vol. X.), and in the discussion that followed. As to the remarks by Mr. Justice White, cited regarding the Deccan Relief Act, the illustration was scarcely appropriate at all. Some measure of the kind was manifestly required; it was demanded on every hand, alike on behalf of the ryot and the State; so that it was quite inappropriate to say that the failure of the Act was due to the inadequate constitution of the Council, or imperfection of the system. He was quite aware that severe criticism of the working of the measure had been made by Mr. Justice West. No one could have a higher appreciation of the ability of that eminent Judge than he (Mr. Wood) had, and no doubt his criticisms were appropriate to the manner in which the subject came before him; but it is easy to criticise any measure of that sort—the Irish Land Act, for instance,—if we begin on the assumption that everything belongs to the landlord; although, in the face of the now general conviction that something must be done for the tenant, it is easy to see that this kind of criticism may be overdone. The Deccan Relief Act was honestly intended to benefit the masses of society and the cultivators of the soil. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Dacosta referred also, by way of illustration, to the Bengal and Behar Rent Bills, and it is much to be desired that some member of the Association would furnish an exposition of these projects of law. In the *Calcutta Review* of January, 1881, there was an article on the subject, showing that the tendency of the Bills was to depress the ryots and enhance the power of the landlords, and that was not what most members of the Association would desire. They would remember that Sir Richard Temple, in his recent address to the Association, said that one special duty of the Association was to extend and defend tenant-right in India. (Hear, hear.) To Mr. Dacosta's reference to the "flourishing condition of Bengal" he must demur, if it meant that the progress of Bombay and Madras has not been proportionate. Indeed, he should almost be prepared to maintain the opposite proposition—that the cultivators of Bengal are more depressed,

and far less able to improve their position, than in other parts of India. To this proposition there are two qualifications. First, in Bengal there is a far more constant and regular supply of water. Rain seldom fails; Bengal proper is scarcely ever visited by drought and severe famine; whereas, in Bombay and Madras, you have the very opposite conditions in large tracts of country, where the soil is arid, and the rainfall scanty. The second consideration is—and this cuts across the point of Mr. Dacosta's argument—that since the Rent Law of 1859, occupancy rights have been granted to large classes of Bengal cultivators, the former power of the zemindars and middlemen to rack-rent having been curtailed. By that means the cultivators have a far better chance than ever before. That accounts for a good deal of the prosperity spoken of in the official reports—a prosperity which, it must be remembered, is only relative to the former condition of Bengal. In conclusion, Mr. Wood said he cordially agreed with those portions of Mr. Dacosta's paper that really followed its title, and he could only wish that some other members of the Association would follow it up on the constitutional side of the question. The reform and reorganization of the Indian Council has been impending for several years, and must be taken up ere long. (Hear; hear.) With Mr. Dacosta's concluding paragraph he entirely coincided. It commences thus: "The only chance of a favourable solution seems to lie in the development of public opinion at home, to whose influence Parliament and the Government must both yield." The question is, how to get public opinion aroused to the matter. The Press cannot do it—or, at least, they do not—except the *Times*, which furnishes a biassed telegram from India every week, always more or less misleading. Nothing is more difficult than to get the London Press to give anything like regular attention to India. If the newspapers did, the public, he believed, would quickly respond. But, meantime, the only means open to the friends of India are meetings such as these. Hence they were under obligation to the reader of this paper. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. O. C. MULLICK said: as a Native of India, that he desired to offer a few remarks. He rose after the first speaker, not because he thought it likely that he should say anything valuable, but to express regret at the comparatively thin audience, which was already thinning away. It was quite a typical thing to find this disregard of Indian matters. He expected to find a larger number of his own countrymen, as well as a larger number of Englishmen, ready to take part in the discussion of a question of such vital importance to 250,000,000 of Indians. (Hear, hear.) The question advanced by the opener of the

debate had been considered from the point of view, not only by whom is India governed, but also from the point, how is India governed, and what are the remedies which ought to be applied to matters in which the Government of India are deficient in administration. Of course, the question in that form would be too wide to be discussed in a meeting like the present, but, taking one or two points out of the remarks made by the opener of the debate, he (Mr. Mullick) wished to speak briefly on the question of the representation of India. (Hear, hear.) That appeared to him to be the question upon which must depend the ultimate solution of the question of the proper administration of India. (Hear, hear.) There was no doubt that no country could be governed by those who were away from it. A country, in order to be properly governed, must be governed by those who are in it. The best persons to express their own wants and requirements are the persons who are affected. Unless they have the opportunity of not only stating their grievances, but of remedying them, the country can never be well governed. Especially was this the case in regard to India. And yet, what was the position? A nation which has always been brought up to admit the principle of true constitutional government—a nation brought up to feel that every individual member of that nation becomes an active part of the government of his country,—has the power over India; and as India is presided over by such a nation, it is impossible that that nation should govern India on any other than representative principles. Indeed, it had often been laid down by eminent English statesmen,—amongst others, by Mr. Gladstone himself—that the grand principle on which India must be governed is that it must be governed for the good of the Indians. If that was to be attained, it was necessary, in the first place, to ascertain the wishes of the people; and, secondly, to put in their hands the power of carrying such measures as would best suit them. It might be said, and he would admit, that it would be a very difficult and complicated question to advise means whereby the representation of the whole of India might be achieved. But the difficulty, enormous as it might be, ought not to prevent the introduction of a scheme to effect an experiment with the view of ascertaining what measures should be taken to secure the ultimate end—representative government. The great complaint which the people of India had to make on the subject was that nothing had been done in order to ascertain whether the people are capable of governing themselves; and if so, to what extent measures might be introduced in order to secure this object. An experiment might, for instance, be made in the matter of municipal government, by introducing elective representation among municipal bodies. The only

instance in which anything of the kind had been done was in the Presidency towns; and, so far as experience had gone, the system had worked very satisfactorily, and, in his opinion, the time had arrived when the system might be extended by introducing it into the interior of the country. (Hear, hear.) Touching on the question of the constitution of Legislative Councils, it might doubtless be said by those who looked at the matter from outside, that in the constitution of Legislative Councils in India the principle is already in operation, from the fact that there are one or two Native Princes on them. It might be said that there has been in this way sufficient machinery provided for the representation of the people of India. No greater mistake could be made than to allow that idea to pass. These Councils, in the first place, as the opener of the debate had pointed out, deliberate on questions, but their deliberations are confined to themselves. There is not in India such a thing as strong public opinion. It would be remembered that when Lord Lytton went out to India as Viceroy, a measure was passed to put down the Vernacular Press. This was rescinded a few months ago; but the effect of such an Act on the infant Press of India could well be imagined. Under such circumstances, there could be nothing like public opinion in India; and, that being so, the doings of the Legislative Councils are liable to no check from the people of the country, for the latter have no means of knowing what transpires within the four walls of the Council-chamber, and have no opportunity of expressing their own opinion, or making it heard. Therefore, to consider the present constitution of the Councils any solution of the question of the proper administration of India, would be but to be satisfied with a very limited and narrow system. It would be necessary that the Indian Councils should be thoroughly remodelled; and it appeared to him (the speaker) that if Legislative Councils were constituted so as to conform to representative principles on a wider scale, it would be advantageous. For instance, why could not the experiment be made of developing the institutions already in existence, by diffusing into them the spirit of national and popular representation, by introducing to the Councils a larger number of members—members who would not be there for political or other reasons, such as being of high family, but because they would be really active and intelligent men, capable of representing the people—men with talent, ability, and will? Let these be admitted in sufficient numbers; then, and then only, could the experiment of representation be said to have been properly tried. (Hear, hear.)

MIRZA PEER BUKHSH said he could not refrain from expressing his thanks to Mr. Dacosta for the great ability with which he had dealt with the defects in the system of British government in India. Mr. Dacosta, indeed, had rendered great service to the 250,000,000 of India by his very convincing treatment of the subject; and he had clearly shown that India is, in fact, ruled by a Secretary of State, responsible in no way to the people of India, but to the Parliament of this country—an official who must conduct himself to please his political party, even at the cost of his own convictions, and whether the interests of India are advanced or not. The evils of the present system are numerous and gross. Justice, for instance, is most difficult to procure; appeals from Indian officials to the Secretary of State are usually vain; petitions are remitted back to the Governor-General in India for inquiry, and the Governor-General remits them to a high official, who refers them to subordinate officials; ultimately the memorial gets back to the person against whom the petition is directed, and his report travels back by the same road. Such a process obviously makes the redress of any grievance extremely improbable, and yet from it there is no appeal. Practically there is no responsibility on the part of those who rule India; they take much money from India, and expend it as they like, without the people having any power in the matter. Such a state of things is not tolerated in any other country connected with the British Empire, and can scarcely be paralleled elsewhere. In all the colonies of England there is a Parliament, or, at least, a potent voice in the management of affairs, and in the raising of revenues. A position so peculiar naturally leads to legislation rather for the interest of Great Britain than India. Take the case of the abolition of the import duties on cotton. Without discussing the abstract merits of the question, look at the losses thrown upon Native holders of goods upon which the duty has been paid. Since merchants can now get the goods without payment of the duty of 5 per cent., holders of stock have no recourse but submission to a dead loss. It was notorious, moreover, that the measure was devised, not in the interests of India, but in the interests of the Lancashire constituencies. Look, too, at the cynical ignoring of any reciprocity in the matter. As they were recently shown, Indian silver plate is subjected to an impost of 1s. 6d. an ounce upon coming into this country—taxed 33 per cent. on its value. Look, also, at the disparity in the salaries given to Native as compared with European officials in India. Without mentioning more, and there would be no difficulty in greatly extending the list of grievances, it must be seen that the present system of government for India is in urgent need of reform. The speaker con-

cluded by expressing an earnest hope that the English public would be induced to take an interest in this profoundly important subject, and learn what is being done in their name.

Mr. ALEXANDER ROGERS said he thought that if the attendance at the meeting had been as large as that which gathered the other day, when Sir Richard Temple was addressing the Association, they would have fully recognized the aptness of the President's warning that, in all the discussions held by the Association, exaggeration of all kinds should be most particularly avoided, especially in discussing Indian subjects. Now, he must say he considered Mr. Dacosta's paper was one that specially manifested this weakness; and had Sir Richard Temple been present, he would no doubt have pointed out that a great many of the statements in the paper were exaggerated. (Hear, hear.) In fact, had he (Mr. Rogers) had an opportunity of perusing the paper before it was delivered, he thought he could have established that there were very few of Mr. Dacosta's statements which he could not have controverted. The paper was, in fact, a most one-sided thing; from beginning to end, the tone was one of disparagement of the whole of the acts of the Government of India, without any proposal of an adequate remedy for the state of things described. The only remedy which Mr. Dacosta proposed was stated in his fifth section; and as, for some unexplained reason, Mr. Dacosta had omitted this altogether when he was reading the paper, he (Mr. Rogers) would beg permission to read the deleted passage: "The development of local self-government, which Lord Ripon has so strongly expressed a desire to promote, would be greatly facilitated by consistent adherence to the course initiated some years ago, when the municipalities of the Presidency and of other towns in India were partly elected by the ratepayers. The working of that measure has been satisfactorily reported upon by the authorities, and it was to have been extended to all the larger towns of the empire; but such extension has been arrested by adverse influences, and a petition from Poona (the capital of the Deccan, and the seat of the Bombay Government during a portion of the year), praying for the introduction of the elective system in its municipality, appears to have been rejected without any reason being assigned for the refusal." It was a pity that Mr. Dacosta could not find room here to give an accurate account of the position of the Indian Government in this matter. But, to proceed with the quotation of the omitted portion: "Adverse influences like those just alluded to must be counteracted, and the municipalities must be

“left to elect their chairmen, before success can be looked for from
“the endeavours of the present Viceroy to give India the inestimable
“benefits of local self-government. The principle could then be
“advantageously applied to the Legislative Council, by the election
“of its non-official members being entrusted to the popularly-
“elected municipalities; that is, to a body of men who would
“possess the confidence of a large and important section of their
“countrymen. The Council, at the same time, should be interdicted
“from legislating at a distance from the metropolis, and from in
“any way preventing non-official members from taking part in its
“deliberations. It is obvious that, without such measures of
“common fairness, the present attempt to develop self-govern-
“ment in the administration of India must, from the causes
“already indicated, prove as unsuccessful as were those which
“Parliament made in 1861, and Lord Mayo's Government in
“1870; while the disappointment which would ensue from the
“frustration of the hopes which are now being raised among the
“Indian populations, could not fail to embitter their feelings, and
“to further diminish their confidence in the good intentions of
“their rulers.” These omitted passages contained, so far as he
(Mr. Rogers) could see, the only suggestion on Mr. Dacosta's part
of a remedy for the evils of which he spoke. That suggestion was to
the effect that elections to the Legislative Council should be left in
the hands of the population which elects the municipalities. Any one
would think, from a reading of the quoted words, that Municipal
Commissions existed all over the country, and were numbered by
hundreds; whereas the fact was that not one town in fifty had a
municipality at all; and, therefore, to entrust elections to the
Legislative Council to the municipalities would be simply impractic-
able, and would certainly not be effective for the purposes desired—
the procuring of the confidence of their fellow-countrymen. To take
one of Mr. Dacosta's mis-statements, it was insinuated that non-
official members of the Council were prevented from speaking their
minds. This was certainly not the case. He (Mr. Rogers) was a
member of the Bombay Legislative Council for some years, and he
could say with the utmost confidence that entire freedom of expres-
sion was exercised by the non-official members. (Hear, hear.) He
must repeat that, with the exception of a proposal which was im-
practicable, and the passage containing which Mr. Dacosta had
omitted to read, the whole of the paper was one tissue of disparage-
ment of the acts and proceedings of the Government, without an
attempt to give them credit even for good motives. In a para-

graph of the first section of his paper, Mr. Dacosta said: "In such circumstances it would, indeed, be a miracle if the Government found itself in unison with the feelings and interests of the governed, and it can, therefore, be no matter for wonder if, notwithstanding the long term of peace enjoyed in India, and the large amount of English capital embarked there in trade and railways, the material condition of her inhabitants over large tracts of the empire should be declining, famine should be assuming greater virulence, the revenue should prove inelastic, and the popular discontent should still be wide-spread, as it was ten years ago, when Lord Mayo so forcibly drew the attention of the Home Authorities to the subject." Well, he had no hesitation in saying that these were mere assertions. A reference to the Parliamentary Paper annually published, showing the moral and material progress of India, would directly contradict Mr. Dacosta. He, for one, must flatly deny that the material condition of the inhabitants of India "was declining," and was prepared to maintain that the prosperity of India was increasing day by day. "Famine," says Mr. Dacosta, "is assuming greater virulence." If this means that in consequence of the measures of Government, famines are becoming more and more frequent and fatal in India, it was an assertion so extraordinary as to render contradiction superfluous. The revenue is "inelastic," says Mr. Dacosta. Well, this is most distinctly a mis-statement, for the last Budget of Major Baring is ample evidence to the contrary, for the Government of India have been able to take off taxes in various ways, and, above all things, to relieve the people of some of the burden on salt. In respect to Mr. Dacosta's allusion to the fatal effects of an excessive duty on salt, it might be remembered that a good deal could be said for the maintenance of the salt-tax. Any person who knew India knew that the masses of the people were particularly poor. Their taxation, therefore, was a most difficult matter, and a tax on salt is about the only way in which taxation could reach the mass of the people. It would have been of more practical value if the author of the paper had suggested any tax in substitution for the salt-tax which could be imposed upon the great masses of India more fairly and with less consciousness of its burdensomeness than any other. By-and-by, when the recent reductions took full effect, the salt-tax would not be more than 5d. per head of the population—equal to, say, a single day's labour. [MIRZA PEER BUKSH: But the Indian labourer gets only 2d. a day.] In this connection Mr. Dacosta says that "the financial embarrassments of the Government have continued to this day, as evidenced by the necessity which has compelled the retention of

“taxes known to be excessively oppressive and unpopular, such as the salt-tax in Madras and Bombay, and the license tax in Bengal and the North-west Provinces.” This was an illustration of the imperfect way in which the paper had been compiled, for it conveyed the idea that the salt-tax merely exists in Madras and Bombay, whereas it extends all over India. Time would not allow of touching upon all the insinuations in Mr. Dacosta’s paper, but one other might be mentioned in order to show that the lecturer’s statements should not be accepted without great allowances. In the first section, Mr. Dacosta says: “Under the new *régime*, the supreme control being exercised by a Cabinet Minister more or less absorbed in the politics of Great Britain, lacking Indian experience, stationed thousands of miles from India, and able to judge of her administration only by the reports submitted to him, the advancement and promotion of Indian officials became, in a great measure, dependent on the impressions created by these reports; while the actual results of the administration, when unrecorded in the reports seen by the Secretary of State, remained unknown to him.” Now, in reply to this insinuation, he (Mr. Rogers) must say that the Secretary of State only nominated Members of Council and Judges of the High Court, and had nothing whatever to do with the promotion of Indian officials; they were promoted in India itself, in accordance with their merits and services. The Secretary of State never, by any chance, interfered with their promotion. The appointments of the high officers of State mentioned rested with him, but the insinuation that the promotion of ordinary officials was dependent upon the nature of the reports they wrote, and was guided by the Secretary of State, was entirely misleading. A little further on, Mr. Dacosta had the following: “Desk-work superseding the active duties of administration, has often been the subject of remonstrance on the part of Provincial Governments, and the last resolution of the Government of Bengal on the subject says: ‘As mentioned last year, the Lieutenant-Governor will be glad if the Commissioner could so arrange his tour as to visit more of the subdivisions within his jurisdiction. . . . The same excuse as in past years is put forward on behalf of the district officer of Alipore—pressure of work at head-quarters. The Lieutenant-Governor has already said that he cannot accept this as sufficient.’” One would think from this that the district officials generally sat still, and did not move about. Well, he (Mr. Rogers) had been a district officer for more than twenty years, and he could conscientiously say that he hardly ever, except in the rainy season, remained in one place more than four or five days. This, indeed, was the general rule; and so

clearly understood was it, that if he had found one of his subordinate officers not moving about actively, the delinquent would have promptly been called to book. Mr. Dacosta's account of the proceedings of the Bombay Government in respect to the Deccan ryots was characteristically unfair. Nothing could have been further from the thoughts of the Government than to injure the ryot. They had the choice of leaving the ryot to take care of himself, or of taking care of him; the latter was chosen, and the Bill was passed with the most philanthropic motives. Mr. Dacosta quoted Mr. Justice West as an opponent of this legislation. Mr. West's idea was simply that by this measure we had done away to a certain extent with the useful influence of the *Saökars*, or Native money-lenders; and if the whole of his report had been read, this would have been seen. What was really at the bottom of the Deccan disturbances was not the excessive enhancement of the assessment—a point which he (Mr. Rogers) had lately explained in a paper read before the Association—but a change in the law which the local authorities had not recommended. Under that law, debts incurred by the cultivators to the money-lenders—which, previously, were allowed to run twelve years—were curtailed to three years. In the longer period the money-lenders had time to arrange matters with their debtors, and hence did not press them unduly. But when three years became the limit within which the money-lenders could sue, they hastened to the Courts to be in time to carry out the process of recovery. That was the whole explanation of the Deccan disturbances. In conclusion, Mr. Rogers said he was afraid he had already exceeded the Association's limit to speakers, and he would, therefore, only add that he could cite at least a dozen more instances where, as he considered, Mr. Dacosta was utterly unfair to the Government of the country, and had throughout imputed unworthy motives to them. But with one of his opinions he had the pleasure to entirely agree. It was that "the only chance of a favourable solution seems to lie in the development of public opinion at home, to whose influence Parliament and the Government must both yield." It was very much to be hoped, however, that the "public opinion" would be "developed" by information less one-sided and more reliable than Mr. Dacosta had afforded in his paper, which appeared to be the production of a man who had lived mostly in Calcutta itself, and, from not having moved about in the interior of the country, really knew little about it, or of the opinions and feelings of the Natives.

Dr. CULLIMORE said that he had had some experience in a large district of Madras during the late famine; and with reference

to the salt-tax, he could say that he had heard many complaints from Natives of their cattle dying for want of salt, which, because of the heavy taxation, they were unable to procure. The circumstance might, of course, have been due to the poverty of the people at that particular time. As to the question of education, his impression was that, as regards higher or university education, the people were over-educated. For instance, he sent, when up country, for a tailor from Madras, and when he came he found him to be a B.A. and M.A. of the University of Madras. This extent of scholarship in a tailor (and it is but an example of many), he thought, justified what he (the speaker) had said about over-education. Of course, if the English people wanted to educate the people of India so that, in course of time, they (the English) could give up India altogether, then educational measures and representative institutions might be judicious; but if, on the other hand, we are to remain in India, they will prove dangerous, useless, and certain to lead to friction in the administration. For he thought that anybody who had lived in India would agree with him that it was not by education, but by British bayonets, that India and its people's happiness would be retained. Mr. Dacosta had alluded to discontent in India. This was due, no doubt, to the increase of taxation, which ought to be taken in hand; but he (the speaker) could not see how the increase of the political power of the Natives and the curtailment of the authority of the Secretary of State would have the effect of lessening taxation. This taxation was, no doubt, a most important question; for, while taxation was heavy, there would always be discontent. As to the system of government, India was enjoying a mild despotism; and this, administered in sympathy with the people, is most in accordance with the genius of all Eastern nations. There were many other despotisms throughout Europe, notably in Russia, and practically also in Germany—yet in those countries the people were happy—and they existed because it was impossible to allow complete political liberty, which was a plant of slow growth, and liable to abuse; and it could not be conceded to India with safety. Then, as regarded the Native States, it was important to know what condition the Natives of these States were in. They had a sort of Home Rule, and it would be interesting to know if that Home Rule protected them, for instance, from famine. He thought that, on the whole, the position of people in such States was worse than that of the Natives under the sway of the British Government. One gentleman, Mirza Peer Bukhsh, had alluded to the expense of government in India, and to the high salaries of the English officials, and had complained of the Natives not getting their share of the money spent. All that he (Dr. Culli-

more) had to say was that the district where he had been stationed had a population of about 1,900,000—greater, for instance, than the population of the kingdom of Servia, and nearly equal to that of Holland or Denmark—and what was the number of European officials? There were the collector and two or three assistants, judge, the medical officer, the engineer and a couple of assistants, with an officer of police. That comprised the European staff; and he failed to see how, in the face of such circumstances, any one could talk about unnecessary expense for officials, whose united salaries could not much exceed 10,000*l*. Then there was a complaint that the Natives were insufficiently paid. That also was not the fact. He knew of a Native surgeon who was paid only Rs. 100 less than he (the speaker) received; and when the mode of living and other necessary expenses of Europeans were contrasted with the comforts the Natives could enjoy at one-fifth of the cost, he considered that the latter were 50 per cent. relatively better off than their English compeers; and he was confident that in the actual work the Englishman took more interest, and was more active, and exhibited vastly more unwearied and painstaking industry than the Native officials—men of the same grade. On the whole, then, he considered that the Native officials were liberally dealt with, and received all, under all the circumstances, they could fairly expect, though he thought their number in the higher branches of the Service might without evil be increased. In conclusion, as the time was up, he would only venture to repeat that neither the permanence of our rule nor the happiness of the people is likely to be increased by legislation on the lines of representation. Representation even in municipal affairs would lead to friction, would be impracticable, and end in contempt for the Government, through its powerless officials. Moreover, it is unsuited to the genius of a people accustomed to be ruled by sovereigns and statesmen. What the Hindu people require is the assurance of their material prosperity, so that their fields may be kept in cultivation, and famine prevented. Then will they be content, and our rule endure as a blessing; and this is to be accomplished by cutting down useless or unproductive expenditure, by curtailing taxation, and, above all, by the avoidance of expensive foreign wars—the fruitful source of domestic oppression and misery.

Mr. DACOSTA, in replying, said: Mr. Rogers has charged the statements in my paper with exaggeration, and their intent with unfairness to the Government; and he complained, specially with regard to the Deccan Relief Act, that no credit had been given to the

Government for the philanthropic view with which that Act had been framed. This last objection might have been intelligible had the paper purported to review our Indian administration; but my object, as I stated at the outset, has been simply to call attention to certain defects in the system of government inaugurated in 1858, and to suggest in what direction a remedy might be found for them. Admitting, however, the philanthropic views contended for by Mr. Rogers, it would only show that the kindest intentions might, under certain conditions, defeat their object, and would strengthen the opinion I ventured to express as to the danger of an Executive legislating for the good of a people without admitting any representative of that people to their deliberations. As regards exaggerations, Mr. Rogers subsequently explained that the charge applied chiefly to two statements: first, that the material condition of the people over large tracts was declining; and, secondly, that the revenue had proved inelastic. Mr. Rogers asserted, in contradiction of the first statement, that the prosperity of the people was increasing day by day. In testing the value of his assertion, I will apply the standard selected by himself—namely, the Parliamentary papers to which he referred—by reading the following extracts from three latest Blue-books, on the “Material Condition of India,” published in 1878, 1879, and 1880. The tracts of country alluded to in my statement include large portions of the Madras Presidency. Mr. Dacosta then read the following passages relating to Madras: “The collections for 1876-77 are returned at “3,296,575*l.*, showing a decrease of 1,248,438*l.* on those of the “previous year. . . . Considering the adverse nature of the season, “the collection was very satisfactory; but collectors had to resort to “coercive processes to a much greater extent than in the preceding “twelve months, the number of defaulters having risen from 336,226 “to 1,242,772” (p. 28). “The collections of land revenue in 1877-78 “amounted to 3,494,884*l.* . . . The decrease, as compared with “1872-73, is 1,198,585*l.* A succession of bad seasons had grievously “affected the circumstances of the ryots” (p. 32). “The land revenue “collections rose to 4,965,548*l.* in 1878-79. . . . Coercive processes “were employed more largely than during the previous year” (p. 34). Here Mr. Dacosta observed that the Blue-book for 1879-80 had not yet appeared, but that the Administration Report of the Madras Government showed that an increase in the sale of land for the recovery of the land-tax had been going on for a number of years; and he argued that so ruinous a mode of collection would not have been resorted to had the ability of the people to bear the taxation not been impaired. He then read the following passages from the same

Blue-books, under the heads of "Finance," "Excise," "Stamps," and "Crime": "In 1876-77, in place of a surplus of 2,428,447*l.*, there "was a deficiency of 924,650*l.* All the chief heads of revenue showed a "diminution" (p. 19). "In 1877-78, a further decline occurred in "the yearly amount contributed to the Imperial Exchequer. The "decrease of revenue and the increase of expenditure were continuous "for three years" (p. 23). "In 1878-79, the revenue rose from "6,986,438*l.* to 9,908,079*l.*, owing principally to the very "large amount under the head of 'Land Revenue,' much "of which was due to the collection of arrears" (p. 22). "Under the head 'Excise' the revenue in 1876-77 fell to 558,369*l.* " . . . The decrease was due to the falling off in the yield of cocoa-nut "toddy, and also to the impoverished condition of the people" (p. 21). "In 1877-78, only 471,069*l.* was realized" (p. 24). "In 1878-79, as the "farming contracts expired, advantage was taken of the opportunity "to introduce changes calculated to improve the revenue. Notwith- "standing, however, the collection of large arrears, the Excise revenue "amounted only to 587,926*l.*, being less than that realized in 1875-76. "The consumption of liquor was low, owing to high prices of food, "loss of population, and the impoverishment of the drinking classes" (p. 24). "Under the head of 'Stamps,' in 1876-77, the collections "fell to 499,336*l.*" (p. 23). "In 1877-78, stamps yielded (only) "489,221*l.* The revenue from Court fee stamps showed a falling off "of 20,000*l.*, but general stamps yielded 10,000*l.* more. These "results were owing to the impoverishment of the people, which "caused a decrease of litigation and an increase in property transfers" (p. 27). "In 1878-79, the stamp collections rose to 530,135*l.* . . . "The increase was due to the enormous transactions rendered neces- "sary by the past famine and the renewal of the Excise leases" (p. 26). "Under the head of 'Crime,' in 1876, the number of offences re- "ported rose to 75,004. . . . Since 1872, when it was 21,975, the "number of convicts in confinement has steadily increased" (p. 9). "The criminal and judicial returns for 1877 show that the amount of "crime was more than double that of 1875. Dacoity increased "sevenfold. . . . There was a large increase of murder cases, and "child-murder by starving mothers was not unfrequent" (p. 12). "The number of offences reported was 181,518 in 1877, and 214,559 "in 1878." Mr. Dacosta contended that this continuous record of impoverishment, distress, and crime fully supported his assertion that the material condition of the people over large tracts of country was declining, and that it disposed of the charge of exaggeration brought against that statement. He then went on to say: Mr. Rogers has

contended that the charge of inelasticity in the revenue is controverted by Major Baring's Budget, recently published in India. It seems to me that the favourable results shown in that Budget are due to retrenchment in military expenditure, and to general economy, rather than to the expansion of revenue. In the published telegrams, the only increase of revenue mentioned is under Excise and Post Office, and must amount to a small figure. [Here Mr. Rogers interrupted by alluding to an increase in the land revenue.] Assuming his information on this point to be correct, I would remind him that, with the serious extent to which the sale of land has been resorted to for the recovery of the land-tax in the Madras and Bombay Presidencies, the alleged additional revenue may have been obtained through greater stringency in the mode of collection, and not from increased ability in the people to bear taxation, which is the only source that can produce elasticity in the revenue. Mr. Dacosta observed, with regard to sundry other objections raised by Mr. Rogers, that several of them seemed to have been hastily conceived, and expressed at times under a feeling of irritation, for which he could only account by assuming that Mr. Rogers, having, as he explained, previously committed himself to certain opinions on the cause of the Deccan riots, and the enactment to which they led, was not a disinterested party in the question, and could not, therefore, consider impartially, and with equanimity, Justice West's condemnation of that unfortunate Act, and Sir Auckland Colvin's strongly expressed opinion contradicting that which Mr. Rogers had given on the chief cause of the disturbances ; that, with regard to the salt-tax, he (Mr. Dacosta) had referred to its effects only in Madras and Bombay, because the tax pressed with greatest severity on the seaboard population in those Presidencies ; and, as to the suggestion of a tax to be substituted for the salt-tax, that the solution of the question was not within the scope of his paper, but would, doubtless, be arrived at satisfactorily by the Legislative Council, after it had admitted to its deliberations men who were, in the true sense of the word, representatives of the people for whom that Council legislated. Mr. Dacosta went on to observe that Mr. Rogers had stated, almost in the same sentence, that the Secretary of State had nothing whatever to do with the promotion of Indian officials, and that the promotion to the highest posts in India, to seats in the Councils and on the benches of the High Courts, rested with the Secretary of State ; that several other statements required correction—those, for instance, as to an insinuation being contained in his paper that non-official members of the Legislative Council were prevented from speaking their minds, and as to a suggestion that the

election of the Legislative Council should be left in the hands of the population, which elects the municipalities. Mr. Dacosta submitted that a careful perusal of the paper would show these statements to be incorrect; and, with reference to what Mr. Rogers had said on the limited opportunities which he (Mr. Dacosta) had had of obtaining information on the condition and feelings of the people, that the source whence the knowledge had been derived had not been mentioned, but that, as the statements in his paper rested generally upon authentic testimony, he thought it unnecessary to reply to the insinuation.

Mr. ROGERS : Are you aware it is very difficult to get a municipality established? I have tried over and over again, and could not get the people to do it.

Mr. DACOSTA : That will be so as long as the Chairman has the power of preventing the free expression of opinion. No man of independence would serve under such conditions. Referring to Mr. Martin Wood's statement regarding the Bengal and Behar Rent Bills, Mr. Dacosta submitted that a perusal of those Bills would show their tendency to be the opposite of what Mr. Wood represented it to be; and, with regard to Mirza Peer Buksh's speech, Mr. Dacosta observed that it expressed the views of the bulk of the Mirza's countrymen, and that it was a fortunate circumstance that Indian gentlemen visiting this country had the opportunity afforded them by the East India Association of proclaiming, within the hearing, as it were, of those who controlled our Indian administration, the wants, feelings, and opinions of the Indian populations, since our rule in India, to be beneficent or enduring, must be conducted with due regard to those feelings and opinions.

Mr. ROGERS : As a magistrate, I have been outvoted myself by my own municipality, and prevented from carrying my own measures.

On the motion of Mr. PIRIE GORDON, seconded by Mr. MARTIN WOOD, the best thanks of the Association were accorded to Mr. Alderman Fowler, M.P., for presiding, and to Mr. Dacosta for his paper. It may be mentioned that the Chairman had to vacate his position shortly before the close of the lengthened proceedings, in consequence of his presence being required in the House of Commons. Mr. PIRIE GORDON occupied the chair during the remainder of the sitting.



OF THE

EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION.

Instituted for the independent and disinterested advocacy and promotion, by all legitimate means, of the public interests and welfare of the Inhabitants of India generally.

The Condition of India.

Correspondence with the Secretary of State for India, by
DADABHAI NAOROJI, Esq.

32, Great St. Helens, London,
24th May, 1880.

TO THE RIGHT HON. THE MARQUIS OF HARTINGTON,
The Secretary of State for India, India Office.

MY LORD,—I beg to submit a series of tables, working out in detail the total production of the Punjab for the year 1876-7.

My objects in troubling your Lordship are as follows :—

In 1876 I read some papers on the "Poverty of India" before the Bombay Branch of the East India Association. These papers are published in the *Journals* of the Association, and I send herewith a copy (Vol. IX., Part 4). At pages 237-9 I have explained how the mode of taking the averages adopted in the various Administration Reports of India was quite wrong. When preparing my papers on the "Poverty of India," I had not sufficient time to work out all the averages for all the provinces in detail. I have now worked out in detail the averages of all the production tables of the Administration Report of the Punjab for 1876-7. I request now that the different Governments in India may be directed to supply their tables of production as fully as are prescribed by the Statistical Committee of Calcutta, that the averages may be correctly taken, as I have done in the enclosed tables, and that, in addition to the tables prescribed, may also be given a summary of the total agricultural production, like the one given at page 138 of my tables, a summary of the whole production (agricultural, manufactures, and mines), like that at page 140, and a table of the absolute necessities of life for an agricultural labourer, like that at pages 142-144.

It is only when such complete information is furnished by the Indian authorities that any true conception can be formed of the actual material condition of India from year to year, and our British rulers can only then clearly see, and grapple with effectually, the important problem of the material condition of India, and the best means of improving it.

I have also to solicit your Lordship to submit my tables to the Statistical Department of the India Office, and to direct it to oblige me by pointing out any mistakes of facts or figures there may be in them.

In troubling your Lordship with these requests, I have no other object than to help, as far as my humble opportunities go, to arrive at the real truth of the actual material condition of India; for it is only natural that without the knowledge of the whole truth on this most important subject, all efforts, however well and benevolently intentioned, must generally result in disappointment and failures.

I also earnestly desire and solicit that your Lordship will kindly take into your consideration the representations I have urged in my papers on the "Poverty of India."

I remain, my Lord,

Your Lordship's most obedient servant,

DADABHAI NAOROJI.

ADMINISTRATION REPORT OF PUNJAB, 1876-7.

Page 77: "Upon the whole, the character of the weather during the year 1876-7 was favourable for agriculture."

I have taken one seer, equal to 2.057 lbs., from the compilation entitled "Prices of Food Grains throughout India, 1861-76, compiled in the Financial Department of the Government of India, Calcutta, 1878."

The prices I have adopted are the average of the prices given in the Report for 1st January, 1876, 1st June, 1876, and 1st January, 1877; the last being the latest price that is given in the Report.

For all such particulars or figures as are *not* given in the Report, I have consulted a Punjab farmer, and adopted such information as he has given me.

There are some figures in the Report which are evidently mistakes, and are much in excess of probability; but I have not altered them; though by retaining them as given in the Report, the quantity and

value of some of the articles become much higher than what they must most probably really be.

Excepting such mistakes, the farmer thinks the tables of the Report give a fair representation of the produce of Punjab; the averages being worked out in the right way they should be, and not as they are given in the Report, worked on a wrong principle.

RICE.

Districts.	Acres.	Per Acre.	Total Quantity.	Price per Re. l.	Total Value.
		lbs.	lbs.	lbs.	Rs.
1 Delhi	27,900	920	25,668,000	13-71	18,72,210
2 Gurgaon	1,591	720	1,145,520	19-2	59,662
3 Karnal	53,113	1,152	61,186,176	21-94	27,88,795
4 Hissar	10,506	745	7,826,970	23-31	3,35,777
5 Rohtak	5,326	670	3,568,420	25-37	1,40,655
6 Sirsa	8,285	869	7,199,665	21-94	3,28,152
7 Umballa	117,941	880	103,788,080	19-38	52,20,728
8 Ludhiana	3,963	1,096	4,343,448	16-45	2,64,039
9 Simla	1,875	620	1,162,500	18-51	62,804
10 Jullundar	9,192	1,085	9,973,320	16-45	6,06,281
11 Hoshiarpur	28,835	752	21,683,920	17-82	12,16,380
12 Kangra	147,766	415	61,322,890	29-48	20,80,152
13 Amritsar	20,128	974	19,604,672	18-51	10,59,139
14 Gurdaspur	81,683	755	61,595,165	15-77	39,05,344
15 Siālkot	74,100	1,029	76,248,900	30-85	24,71,601
16 Lahore	22,415	861	19,299,315	30-17	6,39,685
17 Gujranwāla	9,925	759	7,533,075	19-88	3,78,927
18 Ferozepore	6,643	795	5,201,685	20-91	2,48,765
19 Rawalpindi	1,093	970	1,060,210	12-34	85,916
20 Jhelum	233	943	219,719	11-65	18,860
21 Gujrat	6,969	586	4,083,834	17-82	2,29,171
22 Shahpur	990	790	782,100	22-63	34,560
23 Multan	9,800	750	7,350,000	13-71	5,36,105
24 Jhang	127	281	35,687	13-71	2,603
25 Montgomery	7,870	1,145	9,011,150	13-71	6,57,268
26 Mazraharah	10,178	852	8,671,656	16-45	5,27,152
27 D. I. Khan	1,366	196	267,736	12-85	20,835
28 D. G. Khan	14,001	513	7,182,513	18-	3,99,028
29 Bannu	125	880	110,000	12-85	8,560
30 Peshawar	10,325	894	9,230,550	13-45	6,86,286
31 Hazara	12,274	1,152	14,139,648	28-8	4,90,960
32 Kohat	2,361	1,507	3,553,027	14-83	2,39,920
		Average.		Average.	
Total	708,699	796	564,054,551	20-42	2,76,17,270

I take produce of rice as 25-fold, and deduct 4 per cent. for seed. The quantity will then become 541,492,369 lbs., and value Rs. 2,65,12,580. Again, the price of rice given in the Report is for "first sort" only. The medium or second sort forms the bulk, and there is a lower sort still. The second sort is generally about 75 per cent. of the first sort. I take upon the whole 85 per cent. The value, then, for the whole bulk will be Rs. 2,25,35,693.

WHEAT.

Districts.	Acres.	Per Acre.	Total Quantity.	Price per Re. 1.	Total Value.
		lbs.	lbs.	lbs.	Rs.
1 Delhi.....	159,900	913	145,988,700	53-82	27,12,536
2 Gurgaon	132,425	856	113,355,800	49-37	22,96,046
3 Karnál	113,110	1,319	149,192,090	48-68	30,64,751
4 Hissar	89,048	548	21,398,804	48-34	4,42,662
5 Rohtak	99,428	732	72,781,296	49-37	14,74,200
6 Sirsa	56,310	255	14,359,050	49-02	2,92,922
7 Umballa	296,322	1,000	296,322,000	51-25	57,81,892
8 Ludhiána	137,012	1,013	138,793,156	51-08	27,17,172
9 Simla	3,610	550	1,985,500	38-39	51,719
10 Jullundar.....	269,010	1,339	360,204,390	49-37	72,96,017
11 Hoshiarpur	349,863	692	242,105,196	48-68	49,73,401
12 Kangra	144,170	460	66,318,200	37-02	17,91,415
13 Amritsar	263,265	1,038	273,269,070	52-11	52,44,081
14 Gurdáspur	325,529	856	278,652,824	50-74	54,91,778
15 Siálkot	197,000	910	179,270,000	49-02	36,57,078
16 Lahore	368,000	557	204,976,000	50-39	40,67,791
17 Gujranwála	203,745	793	161,569,785	50-74	31,84,268
18 Ferozepore	241,180	736	177,508,480	53-97	30,10,148
19 Ráwalpindi	424,135	776	329,123,760	68-9	47,76,905
20 Jhelum	480,273	933	448,094,709	64-45	69,52,594
21 Gujrat	268,316	736	197,360,576	57-42	34,37,139
22 Shahpur	199,325	790	157,466,750	53-62	26,86,229
23 Mooltan	186,040	655	121,856,200	41-83	29,13,129
24 Jhang	161,169	674	108,627,906	49-37	22,00,281
25 Montgomery	263,494	1,252	329,894,488	53-48	61,68,558
26 Mazaffargarh	201,363	1,248	251,301,024	43-88	57,27,006
27 D. I. Khan	176,055	777	136,794,735	69-42	19,70,537
28 D. G. Khan.....	156,594	765	119,794,410	44-57	26,87,781
29 Banru	262,728	523	137,406,744	88-28	15,56,487
30 Pesháwar	232,975	600	139,785,000	57-47	24,32,312
31 Hazára	100,570	993	99,866,010	58-97	16,93,505
32 Kohát	97,533	816	79,586,928	70-89	11,22,682
Total	6,609,497	Average. 840-4	5,555,014,081	Average. 53-48	10,38,75,022

I take produce of wheat 25-fold, and deduct 4 per cent. for seed. The quantity will be 5,332,813,517 lbs., and value will be Rs. 9,97,20,021. The price given in the Report is for first sort only. The second sort forms the bulk, and is generally about 12 per cent. lower in price. I take only 8 per cent. lower for the whole bulk.

The value of the whole will then be Rs. 9,17,42,419.

THE CONDITION OF INDIA.

MAKAI (INDIAN CORN).

Districts.	Acres.	Per Acre.	Total Quantity.	Price per Re. 1.	Total Value.
		lbs.	lbs.	lbs.	Rs.
1 Delhi	13,900	1,500	20,850,000	72	2,89,583
2 Gurgaon.....	1,344	"	2,016,000	75.42	26,730
3 Karnál	6,215	"	9,322,500	67.19	1,38,748
4 Hissar.....	89	"	133,500	51.42	2,596
5 Rohtak	73	"	+109,500
6 Sirsa	466	"	+699,000
7 Umballa.....	100,736	"	151,104,000	62.4	24,21,538
8 Ludhiána	62,802	"	94,203,000	66.51	14,16,373
9 Simla	1,282	"	1,923,000	45.94	41,859
*10 Jullundar	86,392	*1,544	133,389,248	63.08	21,14,604
11 Hoshiarpur ...	105,651	1,500	158,476,500	55.54	23,53,375
12 Kangra	65,093	"	97,639,500	39.77	24,55,104
*13 Amritsar	44,426	*1,412	62,729,512	65.14	9,62,995
14 Gurdáspur	49,977	1,500	74,965,500	53.48	14,01,748
15 Siálkot	33,000	"	49,500,000	58.28	8,49,450
16 Lahore	34,150	"	51,225,000	65.82	7,78,253
17 Gujánawála ...	16,535	"	24,802,500	61.02	4,06,465
18 Ferozepore	42,428	"	63,642,000	81.69	7,80,022
19 Ráwalpindi	66,392	"	99,588,000	94.62	10,62,504
20 Jhelum	2,423	"	3,634,500	64.45	56,392
21 Guját	16,507	"	24,760,500	63.57	3,61,098
22 Shahpur	884	"	1,326,000	63.08	21,020
23 Mooltan	142	"	213,000	50.05	4,255
24 Jhang	2,317	"	3,475,500	65.82	52,803
25 Montgomery	2,512	"	3,768,000	49.37	76,321
26 Mazaffargarh
27 D. I. Khan ...	17	"	25,500	90.85	280
28 D. G. Khan ...	30	"	+45,000
29 Bannu.....	37,069	"	55,603,500	124.27	4,47,441
30 Pesháwar	80,542	"	120,813,000	84.42	14,31,094
31 Hazára	198,025	"	297,037,500	95.09	31,23,751
32 Kohát.....	12,920	"	19,380,000	97.92	1,97,916
		Average.		Average.	
	* 130,813	1,499.17	193,118,760	68.4	2,37,64,823
	953,521	1,500	1,430,231,500	+ add for	12,478
				853,500lbs.	
Total ...	1,084,839		1,626,400,250		2,37,76,801

* In the Report crop per acre is given for two districts only, marked *. The average for these two—viz., 1499.17—say 1,500 lbs., is applied to all other districts by me.

† No price is given in the Report for the three districts marked †. The average of the others—viz., 68.4 lbs.—is applied to these.

For makai I take 50-fold, and therefore deduct 2 per cent. for seed. The total quantity will then be 1,593,872,255 lbs., and value will be Rs. 2,33,01,265.

JOW (BARLEY).

Districts.	Acres.	Per Acre.	Total Quantity.	Price per Re. 1.	Total Value.
		lbs.	lbs.	lbs.	Rs.
1 Delhi.....	61,290	503	30,828,870	73.02	4,22,197
2 Gurgaon	197,145	"	99,163,985	69.94	14,17,842
3 Karnál	29,856	"	15,017,568	72.68	2,06,625
4 Hissar	30,312	"	15,246,936	83.65	1,82,270
5 Rohtak	42,353	"	21,803,559	75.42	2,82,465
6 Sirsa	101,408	"	51,008,224	108.83	4,70,859
7 Umballa	85,787	"	18,000,861	72.	2,50,011
8 Ludhiána.....	106,202	"	53,419,606	86.39	6,18,354
9 Simla	3,134	"	1,576,402	50.74	31,068
10 Jullundar.....	25,211	*856	21,580,616	75.42	2,56,139
11 Hoshiarpur	21,602	503	10,865,806	76.79	1,41,500
12 Kangra	56,831	*250	14,207,750	52.11	2,72,649
13 Amritsar	36,509	503	18,364,027	84.34	2,17,738
14 Gurdáspur	123,635	"	62,188,405	63.08	9,85,865
15 Siálkot	122,000	"	61,366,000	83.65	7,33,604
16 Lahore	57,181	"	28,762,043	82.96	3,46,697
17 Gujránwála	64,082	"	32,233,246	88.45	3,64,423
18 Firozepore	195,298	"	98,234,894	100.1	9,81,367
19 Ráwalpindi	43,383	"	21,821,649	77.48	2,81,642
20 Jhelum.....	17,879	"	8,993,137	76.11	1,18,159
21 Gujrát	67,094	"	33,748,282	82.28	4,10,163
22 Shahpur	15,657	"	7,875,471	78.16	1,00,760
23 Mooltan	11,832	*800	9,465,600	59.65	1,58,685
24 Jhang	6,083	503	3,059,749	74.74	40,938
25 Montgomery	21,802	"	10,966,406	69.94	1,56,797
26 Mazáirgarh	10,937	*679	7,460,173	60.34	1,23,685
27 D. I. Khan	19,203	503	9,659,109	94.28	1,02,451
28 D. G. Khan.....	5,925	"	2,980,275	60.42	49,325
29 Bannu	26,282	"	13,219,846	133.7	98,876
30 Pesháwar.....	238,161	"	119,794,983	104.30	11,48,561
31 Hazára	70,079	"	35,249,737	102.98	3,42,296
32 Kohát	10,014	"	5,037,042	109.28	46,092
				Average.	
Total...	1,874,217		942,700,207	82.76	1,13,90,053

* Crop per acre is given for only these four districts, the average of which for 104,861 acres is 503 lbs., and this average is applied to all the other districts for 1,769,356 acres.

For barley I take 16-fold. Deducting for seed $\frac{1}{16}$, the total quantity will be 883,781,444 lbs., and the value will be Rs. 1,06,78,175.

GRAM.

Districts.	Acre.	Per Acre.	Total Quantity.	Price per Rs. 1.	Total Value.
		lbs.	lbs.	lbs.	Rs.
1. Delhi.....	57,500	* 645	37,087,500	72·	5,15,104
2. Gurgaon	101,184	* 620	62,734,080	71·65	8,75,562
3. Karnal	119,935	* 680	81,555,800	72·34	11,27,395
4. Hissar	76,534	645	49,364,430	80·22	6,15,363
5. Rohtak	119,240	* 790	94,199,600	78·16	12,05,214
6. Sirsa	37,762	645	24,356,490	102·85	2,36,815
7. Umballa	175,094	„	112,935,630	76·11	14,83,847
8. Ludhiana.....	171,984	„	110,929,680	77·82	14,25,464
9. Simla	5	„	3,225	51·08	63
10. Jullundar.....	65,158	*1,233	80,339,814	73·37	10,94,995
11. Hoshiarpur	46,324	645	29,878,980	61·02	4,89,658
12. Kangra	370,802	* 290	107,532,580	51·08	21,05,179
13. Amritsar	103,350	*1,394	144,069,900	84·	17,15,117
14. Gurdaspur	31,347	645	20,218,815	73·37	2,75,673
15. Sialkot	21,500	„	13,867,500	74·05	1,87,272
16. Lahore	171,216	„	110,434,320	89·82	12,29,507
17. Gujranwala.....	31,682	„	20,434,890	83·65	2,44,290
18. Ferozepore	255,893	„	165,054,210	96·68	17,07,221
19. Jalandhar	38,263	„	24,679,635	76·79	3,21,391
20. Jhelum	34,115	„	22,004,175	65·14	3,37,798
21. Gujrat	34,728	„	22,399,560	68·	3,08,194
22. Shahpur	23,817	„	15,361,965	74·05	2,07,453
23. Mooltan	8,404	„	5,420,580	57·25	94,682
24. Jhang	12,026	„	7,756,770	73·37	1,05,721
25. Montgomery	81,616	„	52,642,320	77·48	6,79,431
26. Mazaifargah	12,679	*1,942	24,622,618	55·54	4,43,331
27. D. I. Khan.....	11,922	645	7,659,690	95·13	80,833
28. D. G. Khan.....	1,961	„	1,264,845	47·74	26,494
29. Bannu	53,037	* 286	15,168,582	106·28	1,42,722
30. Peshawar.....	947	645	610,815	41·05	13,866
31. Hazara	222	„	143,190	61·71	2,320
32. Kohat	1,984	„	1,279,680	70·36	18,187
		Average.		Average.	
Total	2,272,236	645	1,466,041,869	75·89	1,93,16,062

* Crop per acre is given for these districts only. The average from them is applied to others—viz., 645 lbs.

I take gram 30-fold. Deducting for seed accordingly, the total quantity will be 1,417,173,807 lbs., and the value will be Rs. 1,86,72,194.

INFERIOR GRAINS (as noted below).†

Districts.	Acres.	Per Acre.	Total Quantity.	Price per Re. 1.	Total Value.
		lbs.	lbs.	lbs.	Rs.
1 Delhi	114,677	522	59,861,394	66·85	8,95,458
2 Gurgaon	404,175	447	180,666,225	66·	27,37,367
3 Karnál	196,787	521	102,526,027	64·79	15,82,436
4 Hissar	1,256,158	393	493,670,094	76·79	64,28,833
5 Rohtak	441,437	412	181,872,044	64·79	28,07,100
6 Sirsa	680,225	118	80,266,550	104·39	7,68,910
7 Umballa	195,893	680	133,207,240	66·16	20,13,410
8 Ludhiána	214,111	1,355	290,120,405	68·91	42,10,135
9 Simla	3,406	520	1,771,120	40·11	44,156
10 Jullundar	165,767	395	65,477,965	62·05	10,55,245
11 Hoshiarpur ..	111,933	685	76,674,105	58·41	13,12,687
12 Kangra	30,366	362	*10,992,492
13 Amritsar	71,937	590	42,442,830	67·88	6,25,262
14 Gurdáspur ..	154,306	648	99,990,288	48·	20,83,131
15 Siálkot	94,070	745	70,082,150	65·14	10,75,869
16 Lahore	141,579	374	52,950,546	69·94	7,57,035
17 Gujránwála ..	123,515	449	55,458,235	64·45	8,60,484
18 Ferozepore	477,728	608	290,458,624	82·11	35,37,433
19 Ráwalpindi ..	287,941	554	159,519,314	92·91	17,16,923
20 Jhelum	209,379	722	151,171,638	70·28	21,50,990
21 Gujrát	289,640	632	151,452,480	80·91	18,71,863
22 Shahpur	68,819	1,100	75,700,900	66·16	11,44,209
23 Mooltan	98,847	468	46,260,396	51·08	9,05,646
24 Jhang	55,474	218	12,093,332	60·17	2,00,986
25 Montgomery ..	63,833	686	43,823,738	55·54	7,89,048
26 Mazaffargarh ..	76,969	693	53,339,517	49·37	10,80,403
27 D. I. Khan ..	43,618	485	21,154,730	89·13	2,37,346
28 D. G. Khan ..	178,113	640	113,992,320	54·17	21,04,344
29 Bannu	105,488	536	56,541,568	111·42	5,07,463
30 Peshávar	107,183	550	58,950,650	59·48	9,91,100
31 Hazára	52,074	960	49,991,040	74·05	6,75,098
32 Kohát	69,465	770	53,488,050	112·28	4,76,380
		Average.		Average.	
Total	6,534,963	510·5	3,335,968,007	69·78	4,76,46,800
				Add	1,57,530
					4,78,04,330

† The price for this is not given.

Seed required per acre.		for acres.
† Joár, per acre 40 lbs.	×	2,221,535
Bájra	×	2,339,796
Kangni	×	58,434
China	×	74,842
Moth	×	982,208
Matter	×	106,865
Másh	×	213,465
Múng	×	263,324
Masúr	×	187,544
Arhar	×	86,950

6,534,963

The total of the products of these = 168,694,604, divided by the total 6,534,963 of acres, will give an average of 26 lbs. per acre of seed for a crop of average 510 lbs.—say 20-fold. Deducting, then, 5 per cent. for seed, the total quantity will be 3,169,169,607 lbs., and total value will be Rs. 4,54,14,114.

It should be noted that the prices of jowár, bájrâ, másh, mung, and arhar are nearly the same generally, but of the remaining five kinds of grain—viz., moth, kangni, chiná, matter, and masúr—the prices are generally nearly 25 per cent. lower. The prices I have used in the table are as given in the Report for jowár and bájrâ only, though the acreage of the lower priced grains is 1,409,893 acres out of 6,534,963 acres, or above 20 per cent. If the allowance for the lower price of the five kinds of grain mentioned above were made, the value will evidently be much lower than I have given above. It requires also to be noted that out of the inferior grains a portion goes for the feed of animals in about the following proportions:—

Grain.	Proportion for Human Use.	Proportion for Animal Use.
Bájrâ	$\frac{1}{2}$...	$\frac{1}{2}$
Jowár	$\frac{1}{3}$...	$\frac{2}{3}$
Moth	$\frac{1}{4}$...	$\frac{3}{4}$
Másh	$\frac{2}{3}$...	$\frac{1}{3}$
Also Jow	$\frac{1}{4}$...	$\frac{3}{4}$
Gram	$\frac{1}{2}$...	$\frac{1}{2}$

So that out of the total acreage of grains of all the above kinds, viz.:—

Gram	$2,272,236 \times \frac{1}{2}$	} = 6,000,512 acres, are for animal use, or nearly three- fifths of the total acres, 9,903,457.
Bájrâ	$2,339,796 \times \frac{1}{2}$	
Jowár	$2,221,535 \times \frac{2}{3}$	
Jow	$1,874,217 \times \frac{3}{4}$	
Moth	$982,208 \times \frac{3}{4}$	
Másh	$213,465 \times \frac{1}{3}$	
	<hr/> 9,903,457	

And out of the whole acreage of *all* kinds of grain—i.e., 19,083,971 acres—about 30 per cent. is used for producing food for animals.

POPPY (OPIUM).

Districts.	Acres.	Per Acre.	Total Quantity.
		lbs.	lbs.
7 Umballa	3,620	18	65,160
8 Ludhiána	69
9 Simla.....	244	3	732
10 Jullundar	578
11 Hoshiarpur ...	163
12 Kangra	1,539	3	4,617
13 Amritsar	877	19	16,663
14 Gurdáspur.....	278
15 Sialkot	140
16 Lahore	770	5	3,850
17 Gujranwála ...	147	10	1,470
18 Ferozepore.....	263
19 Rawalpindi ...	53	15	795
20 Jhelum	81	14	1,134
21 Gujrát	336	15	5,040
22 Shahpur	2,182	10	21,820
23 Mooltan	25	6	150
24 Jhang	27	10	270
25 Montgomery ...	94	9	846
26 Mazaffargarh..	40	11	440
27 D. I. Khan ...	23	8	184
28 D. G. Khan ...	535	20	10,700
29 Bannu	15
30 Pesháwar	67	3	201
31 Hazíra	182	9	1,638
Total	12,348	Average.	135,710 for 10,842 acres.
		12.51	add 18,840 „ 1,506 „
			154,550 „ 12,348 acres.

(for which
no crop
per acre
is given,
at 12.51
average.

Government pays Rs. 5 per seer, or Rs. $2\frac{1}{2}$ per lb. to the producer. The total value will therefore be Rs. 3,86,375.

The additional value at which Government sells opium is a part of the national income, as it is chiefly paid by a foreign country as profit of trade, and therefore (as I have done in my "Poverty of India") the net opium revenue will have to be added to the total production of the country. The particular provinces only from which this revenue is derived—viz., Bengal, Bombay, and other opium-producing places—cannot be credited with this income. It belongs to the whole nation, as every place is not quite free to cultivate opium.

TOBACCO.

Districts.	Acres.	Per Acre.	Total Quantity.	Price per Re. 1.	Total Value.
		lbs.	lbs.	lbs.	Rs.
1 Delhi	7,472	888	6,635,136	5.14	12,90,882
2 Gurgaon	2,424	600	1,454,400	14.4	1,01,000
3 Karnál.....	917	525	481,425	16.45	29,266
4 Hissar	2,812	582	1,636,584	16.45	99,488
5 Rohtak	1,851	514	951,414	16.45	57,836
6 Sirsa	381	850	323,850	14.4	23,489
7 Umballa	4,661	560	2,610,160	12.34	2,11,520
8 Ludhiána	1,550	925	1,433,750	27.25	52,614
*9 Simla	5	846	4,230	9.6	440
10 Jullundar	2,793	1,561	4,359,873	24.68	1,76,656
11 Hoshiarpur	3,782	1,733	6,554,206	19.88	3,29,688
12 Kangra	776	532	412,832	12.34	33,454
13 Amritsar	2,169	984	2,134,296	18.51	1,15,305
14 Gurdáspur	3,973	1,040	4,131,920	16.45	2,51,180
15 Sialkot.....	5,785	917	5,304,845	16.45	3,22,483
16 Lahore	3,460	461	1,595,060	16.45	96,964
17 Gujránwála.....	3,259	669	2,180,271	17.14	1,27,203
18 Ferozepore	5,879	651	3,827,229	13.03	2,93,724
19 Ráwalpindi	1,380	1,080	1,490,400	16.45	90,601
20 Jhelum	622	792	492,624	17.83	27,628
21 Gujrát	2,389	593	1,416,677	12.34	1,14,803
22 Shahpur	838	1,700	1,424,600	12.84	1,15,445
23 Mooltan	1,839	656	1,206,384	6.51	1,85,312
24 Jhang	1,178	820	961,860	12.34	77,946
25 Montgomery	851	1,042	886,742	16.46	53,872
26 Mazaffargarh	978	780	762,840	15.09	50,552
27 D. I. Khan	2,029	615	1,247,835	12.68	98,409
28 D. G. Khan.....	783	740	579,420	7.28	79,590
29 Bannu	452	870	393,240	20.6	19,089
30 Pesháwar	1,250	880	1,100,000	21.85	50,343
31 Hazára	27	480	12,960	17.83	726
*32 Kohát.....	3,307	846	2,797,722	10.97	2,55,033
		Average.		Average.	
Total	71,867	846	60,804,785	12.58	48,32,541

* The produce per acre for these is not given in the Report. I have applied the average of the other districts—viz., 846 lbs.—to these.

No deduction is made for nursery or seed. The average of 12.58 lbs. per rupee is rather a high price. It is considered 12 seers or 24 lbs. per rupee would be nearer the average. I have, as above, kept the Report's price, though it is considered so high.

TURMERIC.

Neither produce per acre nor price is given in the Report. I take 10 maunds for green, which gives 2 maunds dry or 164 lbs. dry per acre. The price is taken at, say, 10 lbs. per Re. 1.

4,130 acres \times 164 lbs. = 677,320 lbs., at 10 lbs. per Re. = Rs. 67,732.

CORIANDER SEED.

As above, neither produce per acre nor price is given in the Report. I take as follows:—

6,934 acres \times 330 lbs. dry per acre = 2,288,220 lbs. at 16 lbs. per Re. = Rs. 1,43,014.

GINGER.

As above.

286 acres \times 205 lbs. per acre (dry) = 58,630 lbs. at 7 lbs. per Re. = Rs. 8,376.

CHILLIES.

Produce per acre given for four districts only, viz.:—

No.	2 acres	77½ \times 600 lbs.	=	464,400 lbs.	<div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: middle; font-size: 3em; line-height: 1;">{</div> <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: middle; padding-left: 10px;"> <p>The average of 808 lbs. is applied to the rest. The total quantity then is 19,003,502 lbs. of green crop. Dry quantity will be one-fifth, or 3,800,700 lbs., and at 8 lbs. per Re., the value will be Rs. 4,75,100.</p> </div>
13		611 \times 410 „	=	250,510 „	
18		3,604 \times 924 „	=	3,330,096 „	
30		77 \times 640 „	=	49,280 „	
		————Average		————	
Total...		5,066 808 „		4,094,286 lbs.	
Add for		18,452 at „		14,909,216 „	
		————		————	
		23,518		19,003,502 lbs.	

OTHER KINDS OF DRUGS AND SPICES.

These are chiefly ajmá, bádián, jeree, and sowá. Neither produce per acre nor price is given in the Report. I take as follows:—

Acres, 35,074 at 330 lbs. per acre = 11,574,420 lbs. at average of 14 lbs. per Re. = Rs. 8,26,744.

OIL SEEDS.

Districts.	Acres.	Per Acre.	Total Quantity.
		lbs.	lbs.
1 Delhi	10,260	293	3,006,180
2 Gurgaon	11,506	237	2,726,922
3 Karnál.....	13,018	500	6,509,000
4 Hissar	21,582	242	5,222,844
5 Rohtak	12,304	297	3,654,288
6 Sirsa	79,160	* 80	6,332,800
7 Umballa	27,229	560	15,248,240
8 Ludhiána	11,172	668	7,462,896
9 Simla
10 Jullundar	11,392	715	8,145,280
11 Hoshiarpur	25,911	310	8,032,410
12 Kangra	18,442	352	6,491,584
13 Amritsar	35,996	582	20,949,672
14 Gurdáspur	24,923	408	10,168,584
15 Siálkot	23,806	777	18,497,262
16 Lahore.....	81,894	260	21,292,440
17 Gujranwála.....	17,952	307	5,511,264
18 Ferozepore	70,315	601	42,259,315
19 Ráwalpindi	69,294	311	21,550,434
20 Jhelum	60,169	481	28,941,289
21 Gujrát	50,375	291	14,659,125
22 Shahpur	4,712	750	3,534,000
23 Mooltan	9,541	462	4,407,942
24 Jhang	3,473	252	875,196
25 Montgomery	29,076	477	13,869,252
26 Mazaffargarh	24,453	288	7,042,464
27 D. I. Khan.....	17,660	464	8,194,240
28 D. G. Khan	20,473	492	10,072,716
29 Bannu	4,004	136	544,544
30 Pesháwar	30,244	460	13,912,240
31 Hazára	21,005	533	11,195,665
32 Kohát	5,348	251	1,342,348
Total.....	846,689	Average. 392	331,652,436

* This evidently is some mistake. It may be 280.

Districts, 32; total acres, 846,689; average per acre, 392 lbs.; total quantity, 331,652,436 lbs.

The price of these seeds is not given in the Report. I take as follows: Linseed and sarso, Rs. 3 per maund, or 27 lbs. per Re. 1; til seed, Rs. 4 per maund, or 20 lbs. per Re. 1; taramira, Rs. 2½ per maund, or 32 lbs. per Re. 1.

The quantity of these seeds is about in proportion of 55 per cent. of linseed and sarso, 15 per cent. of til, 30 per cent. of taramira. The price then will be—

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
 55 \text{ per cent.} \times 27 \text{ lbs.} & = & 1,485 \\
 15 \text{ ,,} \times 20 \text{ ,,} & = & 300 \\
 30 \text{ ,,} \times 32 \text{ ,,} & = & 960
 \end{array}
 \left. \vphantom{\begin{array}{rcl} 55 \\ 15 \\ 30 \end{array}} \right\} \text{Average, 27.45 lbs. per Re. 1.}$$

Taking 27 lbs. per Re. 1, the total value will be Rs. 1,22,83,423.

Linseed.....	6 lbs. for seed per acre	} × 55 per cent.	} Average 7·15 lbs.
Sarso	8 " " "		
Til	6 " " "		
Taramira ...	8 " " "		
		× 15 "	} per acre.
		× 30 "	

Taking 7 lbs. of seed required per acre for produce of 392 lbs., gives 56-fold. Deducting 56th part, the total quantity will become 325,730,071 lbs., and total value will become Rs. 1,20,64,076.

COTTON.

Districts.	Acres.	Per Acre.	Total Quantity.	Price per Re. 1.	Total Value.
		lbs.	lbs.	lbs.	Rs.
1 Delhi	24,565	186	4,569,090	6·51	7,01,857
2 Gurgaon	47,855	164	7,848,220	6·51	12,05,563
3 Karnál	21,510	140	3,011,400	6·43	4,68,336
4 Hissar	20,323	87	1,768,101	6·17	2,86,564
5 Rohtak	49,073	70	3,435,110	7·2	4,77,098
6 Sirsa	77	64	4,928	6·17	798
7 Umballa	27,332	72	1,967,904	6·34	3,10,395
8 Ludhiána	11,488	85	976,480	6·34	1,54,019
9 Simla
10 Jullundar	26,093	122	3,183,346	5·14	6,19,328
11 Hoshiarpur	24,420	136	3,321,120	5·49	6,04,940
12 Kangra	6,733	22	148,126	5·14	28,818
13 Amritsar	23,597	64	1,510,208	5·65	2,67,293
14 Gurdáspur	37,474	50	1,873,700	5·14	3,64,533
15 Siálkot	11,425	65	742,625	5·65	1,81,438
16 Lahore	25,305	138	3,492,090	5·49	6,36,082
17 Gujránwála	33,376	129	4,305,504	5·49	7,84,244
18 Firozepore	9,680	158	1,529,440	6·17	2,47,883
19 Ráwalpindi	33,745	128	4,319,360	4·46	9,68,466
20 Jhelum	25,557	122	3,117,954	5·27	5,91,642
21 Gujrát	24,716	43	1,062,788	4·63	2,29,543
22 Shahpur	26,029	50	1,301,450	5·49	2,37,058
23 Mooltan	16,550	82	1,357,100	5·65	2,40,194
24 Jhang	16,881	87	1,468,647	5·27	2,78,680
25 Montgomery	15,338	149	2,359,862	5·31	4,44,418
26 Mazaffargarh	29,632	124	3,674,368	6·	6,12,394
27 D. I. Khan	11,175	115	1,285,125	6·	2,14,187
28 D. G. Khan	29,739	84	2,498,076	5·7	4,38,259
29 Bannu	7,544	73	550,712	5·36	1,02,744
30 Pesháwar	16,468	* 105	1,729,140	5·23	3,30,619
31 Hazára	8,280	100	828,000	4·11	2,01,460
32 Kohát	6,396	121	773,916	4·41	1,75,491
Total	668,876	Average. 105	70,013,890	Average. 5·66	1,23,54,344

* The produce per acre for this is not given in the Report. The average of the others (652,408 acres) is applied to this.

The average of 105 lbs. per acre is evidently too high; 80 lbs. will be nearer the mark. If so, the above quantity and value are nearly $36\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. above the right quantity and value.

Very probably some of the figures of produce per acre are for uncleaned or seed cotton. The report uses the word "cotton" only in the column of produce per acre, while in the column for prices it uses the words "cotton (cleaned)."

HEMP.

Districts.	Acres.	Per Acre.	Total Quantity.
		lbs.	lbs.
1 Delhi	2,100	* 1,158	2,431,800
2 Gurgaon	516	116	59,856
3 Karnal	1,085	450	488,250
4 Hissar	2,788	153	426,564
5 Rohtak	16,146	46 8	7,507,890
7 Umballa	1,619	220	356,180
8 Ludhiāna	1,637	305	499,285
10 Jullundar	3,655	398	1,454,690
11 Hoshiarpur	6,424	192	1,233,408
12 Kangra	5,263	312	1,642,056
13 Amritsar	1,002	444	444,888
14 Gurdāspur	1,622	352	570,944
15 Siālkot	3,205	177	567,285
16 Lahore	537	306	164,322
17 Gujranwāla	* 355	406	144,130
18 Ferozepore	1,649	218	359,482
19 Rawalpindi	417	120	50,040
20 Jhelum	203	360	73,080
21 Gujrat	971	286	277,706
22 Shahpur	2	250	500
25 Montgomery	† 25	366	9,150
30 Peshāwar	39	240	9,360
		Average.	
Total.....	51,260	366	18,770,866

* This is apparently a mistake. The figure is too high.

† The crop per acre for this district being not given in the Report, I have given it the average, 366.

In the Report the figures of crop per acre are given under the heading "Fibres." In the columns per "acres cultivated," cotton and hemp are given under the heading of "Fibres;" and as produce per acre of cotton is given separately, the produce per acre under the heading "Fibres" applies to hemp. The prices are not given in the Report. I take ordinarily prepared fibre as 20 lbs. per rupee. The value of 18,770,866 lbs. at 20 lbs. per rupee will be Rs. 9,38,543.

KASSAMBA (SAFFLOWER).

Neither produce per acre nor price is given in the Report. I take 40 lbs. per acre of dry prepared stuff, and price $2\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. per Re. 1.

Acres, 24,708 \times 40lbs. = 988,320 at $2\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. per Re. 1 gives Rs. 3,95,328

INDIGO.

Districts.	Acres.	Per Acre.	Total Quantity.
		lbs.	lbs.
1 Delhi	100	30	3,000
2 Gurgaon	56	100	5,600
3 Karnál.....	588	30	17,640
4 Hissar	* 785
5 Rohtak	* 1,526
7 Umballa	1,798	62	111,476
8 Ludhiána.....	2,647	33	87,351
10 Jullundar	754	41	30,914
11 Hoshiarpur	1,162	44	51,128
18 Ferozepore	26	24	624
21 Gujrat	47	101	4,747
23 Mooltan	75,364	26	1,959,464
24 Jhang	2	29	58
25 Montgomery	8	20	160
26 Mazaffargarh	20,603	50	1,030,150
28 D. G. Kahn	23,999	29	695,971
		Average.	
Total.....	129,465	31'44	3,998,283
			* add 72,658
			4,070,941

* For these (2,311 acres) produce per acre is taken of the average for the others—viz., 31'44.

The price is not given in the Report. I take Annas 12 per lb., which will give the total value to be Rs. 30,53,205.

VEGETABLES.

Districts.	Acres.	Per Acre.	Total Quantity.	Price per Re. 1.	Total Value.
		lbs.	lbs.	lbs.	Rs.
1 Delhi	11,700	4,753	55,610,100	43-88	12,67,322
2 Gurgaon	* 9,387	*6,000	56,322,000	28-8	19,55,625
3 Karnál	846	4,753	4,021,038	39-77	1,01,107
4 Hissar	3,485	"	16,564,205	28-8	5,75,146
5 Rohtak	920	"	4,372,760	35-65	1,22,658
6 Sirsa	677	"	3,217,781	127-43	1,17,308
7 Umballa	3,495	"	16,611,735	35-65	4,65,967
8 Ludhiána	7,560	"	35,932,680	30-17	11,91,006
9 Simla	7	"	33,271	60-34	551
10 Jullundar	7,731	"	36,745,443	27-43	13,39,607
11 Hoshiarpur ...	3,586	"	17,044,258	32-91	5,17,905
12 Kangra	6,551	"	31,136,903	49-37	6,30,684
13 Amritsar	15,175	"	72,126,775	36-34	19,34,776
14 Gurdáspur	6,790	"	32,272,870	27-43	11,76,553
15 Siálkot	3,000	"	14,259,000	32-91	4,33,272
16 Lahore	5,746	"	27,310,738	24-68	11,06,593
17 Gujranwála	56,988	"	270,863,964	39-77	68,10,761
18 Ferozepore	* 4,274	*2,015	8,612,110	32-91	2,61,686
19 Ráwalpindi ...	4,660	4,753	22,148,980	40-45	5,47,564
20 Jhelum	3,709	"	17,628,877	31-54	5,58,937
21 Gujrát	21,904	"	104,109,712	28-8	36,14,920
22 Shahpur	11,072	"	52,625,216
23 Mooltan	29,239	"	138,972,967	26-74	51,97,194
24 Jhang	23,203	"	110,283,859	20-57	53,61,393
25 Montgomery ...	1,423	"	6,763,519	27-43	2,46,574
26 Mazaffargarh ..	3,095	"	14,710,535	21-25	6,92,260
27 D. I. Khan ...	803	"	3,816,659	33-42	1,14,202
28 D. G. Khan ...	794	"	3,773,882	20-57	1,33,465
29 Bannu	4,152	"	19,734,456	45-25	4,36,120
30 Pesháwar	3,631	"	17,258,143	32-05	5,38,475
31 Hazára	598	"	2,842,294	45-25	62,813
32 Kohát	599	"	2,847,047	31-45	90,526
		Average.		Average.	
Total	256,800	4,753	1,220,573,777	30-98	3,77,02,970
					for 1,167,948,561 lbs.

* Produce per acre is given for vegetables for these two districts only, and the average of these—viz., 4,753—is applied to all others.

The prices I have taken above are given in the Report for potato only, and the average comes to, say, 31 lbs. per Re. 1. This is a high average price. The average price of potato will be nearer 60 than 31 lbs. I take, however, the average of 31 lbs.

Now out of the vegetables grown, about one-eighth only will be potato, and seven-eighths other kind of general vegetables. This will give, out of 1,220,573,777 lbs., seven-eighths of general vegetables = 1,068,002,055 lbs.

The price of vegetables is not given in the Report. It may be taken as $1\frac{1}{2}$ maunds per Re. 1 or 124 lbs., say 100 lbs. per Re. 1, which will give the total value of vegetables to be about Rs. 1,06,80,020.

Again, the average of 4,753 lbs. is of vegetables, but potato will be

only about 30 maunds or 2,460 lbs. per acre; and as potato will be about one-eighth of the acreage planted with vegetables, or about 32,100 acres, the total quantity of potato will be $32,100 \times 2,460 = 78,966,000$ lbs. This, at the price of 31 lbs. per Re. 1, will give Rs. 25,47,290. I make no deduction for seed potato, or seed for vegetables.

TEA.

The produce per acre is given for one district only; but the Report, at page 78, takes the general average to be the same—viz., 96 lbs. The price is not given. I take 3 lbs. per Re. 1.

Total acres, $8,884 \times 96$ lbs. = 852,864 lbs., at 3 lbs. per Re. 1, will give Rs. 2,84,288.

SUGAR.

Districts.	Acres.	Per Acre.	Total Quantity.	1st sort. Price per Re. 1.	Total Value.
		lbs.	lbs.	lbs.	Rs.
1 Delhi	34,881	*†1,500	52,321,500	5.49	95,30,328
2 Gurgaon	1,125	646	726,750	6.68	1,08,795
3 Karnál	14,309	"	9,243,614	7.03	13,14,881
4 Hissar	34	"	† 21,964
5 Rohtak	33,324	"	21,527,304	8.14	26,44,631
6 Sirsa	6	* 389	2,334	6.84	368
7 Umballa	25,540	* 280	7,151,200	5.83	12,26,620
8 Ludhiána	14,400	* 661	9,518,400	6.86	13,87,521
9 Simla
10 Jullundar	43,963	* 531	23,344,353	6.51	35,85,922
11 Hoshiarpur ...	42,015	* 507	25,082,955	6.51	38,52,988
12 Kangra	8,139	* 494	4,020,666	6.43	6,25,297
13 Amritsar	36,579	646	23,630,034	7.11	33,23,492
14 Gurdáspur	41,375	* 360	14,895,000	5.65	26,36,283
15 Siálkot	29,009	646	18,739,814	6.51	28,78,619
16 Lahore	2,527	"	1,632,442	5.65	2,88,927
17 Gujránwála ...	26,625	"	17,199,750	7.2	25,27,743
18 Ferozepore	1,916	* 410	785,560	6.	1,30,926
19 Ráwalpindi ...	2,381	646	1,538,126	6.34	2,42,606
20 Jhelum	414	"	267,444	5.83	45,873
21 Gujrát	7,221	* 660	4,765,860	6.51	7,32,082
22 Shahpur	1,312	646	† 847,552
23 Mooltan	3,726	"	2,406,996	6.17	3,90,112
24 Jhang	260	* 261	67,860	5.91	11,482
25 Montgomery ...	113	646	72,998	6.17	11,831
26 Mazaffargarh ...	4,355	"	2,813,330	5.83	4,82,560
27 D. I. Khan ...	88	"	56,848	5.65	10,061
28 D. G. Khan ...	55	"	35,530	5.23	6,793
29 Bannu	5,443	"	3,516,178	5.36	6,56,003
30 Pesháwar	9,914	"	6,404,444	6.08	10,53,362
31 Hazára	561	"	362,406	5.49	66,022
32 Kohát	20	"	12,920	5.74	2,250
		Average.		Average.	
Total	391,630	646	253,012,132	6.34	3,97,74,378 for 252,142,616 lbs., excluding the two quantities marked †.

* For these districts only is the produce per acre given in the Report. I have applied the average of these to others.

† This is evidently a mistake. Though other districts, such as Ludhiána are better than

Delhi, and while 661 lbs. is considered a fair average for Ludhiana, 1,500 for Delhi cannot be correct. It is more likely 500 than 1,500. If 500 be adopted, the average will become 487 instead of 646 lbs. And it is also considered that an average of about 489 lbs. will be near the mark. I have allowed the figure 1,500 to remain, though this increases the average above 487 lbs. nearly 32 per cent.

The average price, as obtained on the basis of the prices given in the Report, is for "first sort," or what is called "misri." But there are different qualities of sugar—viz., gól, red sugar, ordinary second sort sugar, and best or first sort sugar. Taking the price of first sort as averaging 6 lbs. per rupee, the prices of the other kinds are:—

Gól.....	24 lbs. per rupee	} Of these the first two form nearly two-thirds, and the last two form one-third of the whole quantity. Taking in this ratio, we get
Red Sugar	16 " "	
Ordinary second	7 " "	
First sort	6 " "	

Two-thirds at 20 lbs. = $13\frac{1}{3}$ }
 One-third " $6\frac{1}{2}$ " = $2\frac{1}{6}$ } or $15\frac{1}{2}$, or say 15 lbs. per rupee.

The whole quantity, being 253,012,132 lbs., will, at 15 lbs. per rupee, give the total value Rs. 1,68,67,475.

For seed, to deduct cane equal to 40 lbs. of sugar per acre. This gives 16-fold, and taking the higher average of 646 lbs., I deduct, say, 6 per cent.

The whole quantity is then 237,831,405 lbs., and the whole value is then Rs. 1,58,55,427.

If, as I have pointed out above, the average of Delhi were taken 500 lbs. instead of 1,500 lbs., which would make the average produce of the whole of Punjab 487 lbs. instead of 646 lbs., the above quantity and value will prove some 30 per cent. higher than they should be.

It may be noted here that the Report itself makes the average 449 lbs. only, on the fallacious principle of simply adding up and dividing by the number of districts; while, when properly calculated, the figure should be 646 instead of 449. This is an instance of how misleading and incorrect the averages are as they are generally calculated in the Administration Reports.

PUNJAB, 1876-7.
SUMMARY OF PRODUCE OF ALL DISTRICTS.

Produce.	Acres.	Total Quantity.	Average per Acre.	Total Value.	Average Price per Re. 1.
		lbs.	lbs.	Rs.	lbs.
Rice.....	703,699	541,492,369	796	2,25,35,693	20.42
Wheat.....	6,609,497	5,332,813,517	840.4	9,17,42,419	53.48
Makai (Indian Corn)	1,084,339	1,593,872,255	1,500	2,33,01,265	68.4
Jow (Barley)	1,874,217	883,781,444	503	1,06,78,175	82.76
Gram	2,272,236	1,417,173,807	645	1,86,72,194	75.89
Inferior Grains	6,534,963	3,169,169,607	510.5	4,54,14,114	69.78
Poppy (Opium)	12,348	154,550	12.51	3,86,375	.4
Tobacco	71,867	60,804,785	846	48,32,541	12.58
Turmeric.....	4,130	677,320	164 (dry)	67,732	10
Coriander Seed	6,934	2,238,220	330 (")	1,43,014	16,
Ginger.....	286	58,630	205 (")	8,376	7
Chillies	23,513	3,800,700 (dry)	{ 803 (green) }	4,75,100	8
Other kinds of Drugs and Spices	35,074	11,574,420	{ 161.6 (dry) }	8,26,744	14
Oil Seeds.....	846,639	325,730,071	330	1,20,64,076	27
Cotton.....	668,876	70,013,890	392	1,23,54,344	17
Hemp	51,260	18,776,866	105	9,38,543	5.66
Kassamba (Safflower)	24,708	988,320	366	3,95,328	20
Indigo.....	129,465	4,070,941	40 (dry)	30,53,203	2.5
Vegetables	256,800	{ 1,068,002,055 }	31.44	1,06,80,020	13
Ten	8,884	78,966,000	4,753	25,47,290	100 Green Vegetables.
Sugar	391,630	852,864	2,460	2,84,288	31 Potato.
		237,831,405	96	1,58,55,427	3
			646		15 { Average of four qualities.
Total	21,616,420			27,72,56,263	

{ Rs. 2½ per lb.
paid by Govt.

PUNJAB, 1876-7.

MANUFACTURES.

Goods.	Value given in the Report.	Deduct for raw Material already calculated and included in the Produce, or imported and paid from Produce.	Balance representing Labour.
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Silks	19,62,049	Say half for Material (imported)	9,81,024
Cottons	1,75,03,556	" 40%	1,05,03,334
Wool	9,42,329	" 20%	9,42,329
Fibres	6,41,578	" 25%	5,13,263
Paper	1,58,565	" 3rd	1,18,924
Wood	67,28,686	" 40%	67,28,686
Iron	43,26,132	"	28,84,088
Brass and Copper	6,38,573	"	3,88,144
Building	43,22,867	"	43,22,867
Leather	63,21,802	"	63,21,802
Gold and Silver Lace	56,27,054	" 3rds	18,75,685
Dyarrg	7,38,926	" Material not stated	7,38,926
Oil	12,45,966	" 3rds, or say $\frac{1}{2}$ Material	6,22,983
Shawls	8,96,507	" 17th Material imported	8,21,798
Other Manufactures	1,30,81,205	" Not described	30,81,205
		Total	4,08,40,058

MINES.

There is no clear statement of the value of the produce of mines given in this Report. The chief article is salt. The Report does not give any account of the cost of salt.

Parl. Return No. 176 of 1878 gives (page 30) "the quantity manufactured, excavated, or purchased" during the year (1876-7) as 1,795,956 maunds. In the statistics published by the Government of India (1875) at Calcutta, Part III., page 79, it is said: "Since 4th July, 1870, 'one anna per maund has been charged as the cost price of the salt, in 'addition to the duty.' At this rate the above production of salt—viz., 1,795,956 maunds—will cost Rs. 1,12,247. Duty is paid from the produce of the country.

For other minerals I can get no estimate. I roughly, and as a very outside estimate, put down the *whole* product of mines at Rs. 3 lakhs.

STOCK.

I am unable to make any estimate of the annual addition to stock during the year. All that portion, however, which is used for agricultural or manufacturing purposes need not be estimated, as its labour, like that of the agriculturist and the manufacturer himself, is included in the agricultural or manufacturing produce. The portion of the annual produce or addition, which is used for other than agricultural and manufacturing purposes, such as carriage and food and milk, needs to be added to the production of the year. Though I cannot estimate this, still it will not matter much, for, as I have shown in the table for inferior grains, a certain portion of them goes in the feed of animals, and as this portion supplies the feed of the *whole* stock that requires grain and not merely that of the *annual* addition, the non-estimate of that portion of the *annual* addition to the stock which is used for carriage and for food may be more than covered by the value of the grain used for animals. Moreover, as I also give a margin upon the total estimate for any omission, any such item will be fully provided for.

SUMMARY OF THE TOTAL PRODUCTION OF PUNJAB, 1876-7.

	Value.
Agricultural Produce.....	Rs. 27,72,56,263
Manufactures.....	,, 4,08,40,058
Mines.....	,, 3,00,000

Rs. 31,83,96,321

In order to meet any omissions (fish, &c.), I allow a further margin of above $3\frac{1}{2}$ crores of rupees, making, say, the whole produce of Punjab $35\frac{1}{2}$ crores of rupees, or at 2s. per rupee = 35,330,000*l.*, which, for a population of 17,600,000, gives 2*l.* per head per annum at the outside for the year 1876-7.

The approximate estimate I had made out for the year 1867-8 in my paper on the "Poverty of India" was 49s. 5*d.*, showing that either my calculation for the year 1867-8 was too high, or the production of the province has diminished in value. The truth most likely is between both.

At all events, unless any error of importance is pointed out, it seems clearly established that the value of the production of one of the best provinces of India is Rs. 20 per head per annum at the outside.

FOOD PRODUCE, 1876-7.

GRAIN.

Total Quantity.
lbs.

Rice	541,492,369
Wheat	5,332,813,517
Makai (Indian Corn)	1,593,872,255
Jow (Barley)	883,781,444
Gram	1,417,173,807
Inferior Grains	3,169,169,607

Quantity raised

Total..... 12,938,802,999

for Animals. about

Gram 1,417,173,807 lbs. $\times \frac{1}{2} =$ 708,586,903Jow... 883,781,444 „ $\times \frac{1}{2} =$ 662,836,083Jowar ... 2,221,535 acres $\times \frac{1}{3} =$ 1,481,023 lbs. perBajrá ... 2,339,796 „ $\times \frac{1}{2} =$ 1,169,898 acre lessMoth..... 982,208 „ $\times \frac{1}{4} =$ 736,656 seedMash..... 213,465 „ $\times \frac{1}{4} =$ 71,155 (510-26)Total... 3,458,732 $\times 484 =$ 1,674,026,288

Total... 3,045,449,274

Balance remaining for }
human use } 9,892,853,725

Or 562 lbs. per annum, or 1 lb. 8·65 oz. per day per head for a population of 17,600,000

Even taking the *whole* quantity of grain as for human use, and thus not allowing any portion at all for animals (which would, of course, not be right to do), the quantity per annum will be 735 lbs. or 2 lbs. per day per head.

In the value I have calculated for grain, I have taken the *whole* grain—i.e., including the portion for animals.

VEGETABLES.

General Vegetables.

Total quantity, 1,068,002,055 lbs., gives 60·7 lbs. per annum or, 2·66 oz. per day per head.

POTATO.

Total quantity, 78,966,000 lbs., gives 4·48 lbs. per annum, or 2 oz. per day per head.

LAND REVENUE OF THE PRINCIPAL PROVINCES OF INDIA FOR 1875-6.*

	Revenue.	Population.	Revenue per Head.
	Rs.		Rs. a. p.
Bengal.....	3,77,65,067	60,502,897	0 10 0
Punjab.....	2,00,15,260	17,611,498	1 2 2
N.-West Provinces.....	4,24,57,444	30,781,204	1 6 0 $\frac{3}{4}$
Madras	4,54,56,128	31,672,613	1 6 11
Bombay (including Sind)...	3,69,43,563	16,302,173	2 4 3

* I have taken 1875-6, for, on account of the famines in the Bombay and Madras Presidencies in the year 1876-7, a comparison for the year 1876-7 will be an unfair one.

PUNJAB, 1876-7.
COST OF ABSOLUTE NECESSARIES OF LIFE OF AN AGRICULTURAL LABOURER.

Food.—*Man.*

Items.	Quantity per Day.	Quantity for 1 Year.	Price for Re. 1.	Cost for 1 Year.	Remarks.
Flour	Seers. 1	Seers. 365	Seers. 25	Rs. As. 14 9	The price in the Report is 20 seers for first sort; I have taken 25 per cent. lower price for lower quality.
Rice	$\frac{1}{4}$	91	13	7 0	The price in the Report is 10 seers for first sort; I take 30 per cent. lower price for inferior quality.
Dal	$\frac{1}{8}$	45	18	2 8	The price in Report is 16 seers; I take it 12 per cent. lower.
Salt	1 oz.	11	$9\frac{1}{4}$	1 3	The price of the Report, which is Government sale price.
Ghee	1 "	11	3	3 11	The price in the Report is less than 2 seers.
					In taking 3 seers, I lower it above 50 per cent., or rather to the price of oil.
					The quantity, 1 oz., is also rather low for a Punjabee.
Condiment ... 2 pies worth.				3 13	
Tobacco ... 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ "			...	2 14	
Vegetables ... 1 "			...	1 8	These are regarded as under the mark.
			Total...	37 2	Without any meat, sugar, milk, or any drink, or any kind of luxury whatever.

Woman.

All the above items will be nearly the same, except tobacco. Deducting tobacco, it will be Rs. 34-2 as.; say Rs. 32.
Two more Members in a Family.

1 young person, say, between 12 and 18, say Rs. 26, though there will not be so much difference.
1 " " under 12, say " 0, though this cannot be the case generally.

PUNJAB, 1876-7.

COST OF ABSOLUTE NECESSARIES OF LIFE OF AN AGRICULTURAL
LABOURER—Continued.
CLOTHING FOR ONE YEAR.

Man.	Woman.	Remarks.
Rs. a.	Rs. a.	
2 Dhotees..... 1 0	2 Pajamas 1 0	No holiday clothing, nor for occasions of joy and sorrow, are reckoned.
2 Pairs Shoes 1 0	1 Gagra 2 0	
1 Turban 1 0	2 Chadars. 1 8	
2 Bandis for warm and cold weather..... 1 8	4 Cholees 1 0	
2 Kamlees 4 0	Bangles..... 0 8	
1 small piece of Cloth for Langootee, &c. 0 4	2 Pairs Shoes 0 8	
1 Chadar 0 12	Hair-dressing 0 3	
1 Pajama 0 12		
Total ... 10 4	6 11	

For one young person, say, Rs. 6 ; for the second, say, nothing.

FAMILY EXPENSES IN COMMON.

	Rs. a.		
Cottage, Rs. 60 ; say	4 0	for one year.	Calculated on the lowest scale, without any furniture, such as cots or mats, or stools or anything.
Repairs	3 0	"	
Cooking and other Utensils	3 8	"	
Firewood, $\frac{1}{2}$ anna per day ...	5 11	"	
Lamp Oil, 1 oz. per day, at 3 seers per Re. 1	3 12	"	
Total ..	19 15		

Taking Four in the Family.

	Food.	Clothing.	Family Expenses.	Total.
	Rs.	Rs. a.	Rs. a.	
Man.....	37	10 4		
Woman	32	6 11		
Youth (12 to 18)	26	6 0		
Child (under 12)	0	0 0		
	95	22 15	19 15	137 14—say, Rs. 136.

Which will be Rs. 34 per head per annum in a family of four, against the production of Rs. 20 per annum at the outside.

No wedding, birth, and funeral expenses calculated, nor medical, educational, social, and religious wants, but simply the absolute necessities for existence in ordinary health, at the lowest scale of cost and quantity.

The prices this year are the lowest during ten years.

The Report says (page 83): "Salt and tobacco show a rise in price." This is a mistake into which the writer is led by the mistake of the clerk in taking his totals and division by the number of districts. The figures in table 45 (page clxxvii.), in the line of the "general average" of tobacco, viz., 4-5 and 5-7, are wrong; and so also in the line of salt, 7 and 7-5 are wrong. I do not mean these figures are wrong on account of the fallacious principle of the Report in taking averages, but in taking the average according to the Report's own method,—i.e., of adding up the columns and dividing by the number of districts.

It is requested that any further communication on this subject may be addressed to—

The Under Secretary of State for India,
India Office, London, S.W.

India Office, S.W.
9th August, 1880.

SIR,—I am directed by the Secretary of State for India to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 24th May, enclosing a table of statistics relating to the value of the production of the Punjab for the year 1876-77.

In reply, I am to thank you for your communication, but with reference to your request that the several Governments in India may be directed to supply similar statistics of production, I am to remark that as regards the important province of Bengal, means do not exist of supplying the information you desire; whilst as regards those provinces for which such information does already exist, it appears very questionable whether the results given, owing to the absence of any sufficient machinery for their preparation, can be relied upon as trustworthy. Your letter and its enclosure have, however, been sent out to the Government of India.

I enclose herewith for your information copy of a memorandum upon your letter, and also copies of statistics similar to those compiled by yourself, which have been recently prepared in this Office.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

LOUIS MALLET.

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji.

ENCLOSURE.

Memorandum on a Letter from Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, dated 24th May, 1880.

In this letter Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji requests that the several Governments in India may be instructed to furnish statistical information regarding the agricultural, mining, and manufacturing produce of their respective administrations, and that a summary may also be given, similar to one which he has prepared for the Punjab, and which he submits with his letter, in order that "a true conception may be formed" "of the actual material condition of India from year to year." He also asks that his tables may be submitted to the Statistical Department of the India Office, and that any mistakes of facts or figures may be pointed out to him.

In January, 1879, I made calculations for the greater part of India similar to those made by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji for the Punjab; copies of these are attached.* I do not, however, put much faith in the accuracy of the figures from which these calculations are made. The agricultural statistics of India, as they are published, can hardly be very reliable, as they are based upon averages, each average referring to a very large area, in which there may be, and probably are, many variations of conditions and circumstances; whilst in parts, such as the large and wealthy Presidency of Bengal, no statistics of agricultural produce are available.

In examining Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's paper, it appears that in his calculations he has omitted to make any allowance for the value of straw, and he has made no attempt to estimate the value of the increase of agricultural stock, but he has added an arbitrary sum for the latter and for other omitted items.

Having, however, arrived at some figures supposed to represent the value of the produce of a certain district, the question arises as to how these figures should be applied in order to show the comparative prosperity or otherwise of the people in that district. Mr. Dadabhai has adopted the principle of equally apportioning the value of agricultural produce and manufactures, as ascertained by him from the statistics available, amongst the whole population, without distinguishing how many are agriculturists, how many mechanics, and how many belong to other trades or professions, or possess property, and whose incomes, therefore, are derived directly neither from agriculture nor from manufactures. Thus he omits all reference to railway wealth, Government

* I have not inserted these tables, as those concerning Punjab are nearly similar to mine.

stock, house property, profits of trade, salaries, pensions, non-agricultural wages, professional incomes, and returns to investments, and all other sources from which a man who does not grow food himself may obtain the means of purchasing it.

From the Census Report of 1871, it appears that, out of a total population of 17,611,498 under British administration in the Punjab, 9,689,650 are returned as agriculturists, 1,776,786 adult males, equivalent to about 4,500,000 of population, as engaged in industrial occupations; thus leaving a population of nearly 3,500,000 directly dependent neither upon agriculture, manufactures, nor mining, and who must therefore derive their means of subsistence from other sources.

Mr. Dadabhai makes out the total value of the agricultural produce of the Punjab to be Rs. 27,69,71,976,* and that from manufactures and mines Rs. 4,11,40,058. To this he adds, to meet any omissions, a further margin of $3\frac{1}{2}$ crores, making the whole produce of the Punjab $35\frac{1}{4}$ crores of rupees, "which, for a population of 17,600,000, gives "Rs. 20 per head per annum at the outside for the year 1876-7," to which year the figures he has taken refer. At page 143 of his tables he shows that the cost of absolute necessities of life of an agricultural labourer is Rs. 34 per annum, but he omits to explain how, under these circumstances, the people of the Punjab managed to live, and leaves the reader to draw his own conclusions how, with only Rs. 20 per annum, he can provide for an expenditure of Rs. 34.

Adopting Mr. Dadabhai's figures, with regard to which I will take no exception, I think it may be shown, by another process of reasoning than that which he adopts, that they point to the Punjab agriculturist being in a good condition of prosperity rather than the reverse. First, I think it must be admitted that the agricultural produce belongs in the first instance to the man who grows it. From it he and his family will first provide themselves with food, and the remainder he will sell, either for money to enable him to pay his assessment, &c., or in barter for clothing and other necessities, whilst a part will go to pay wages for labourers and others dependent upon him.

Now, if these premises be admitted, it may be shown that, allowing three-fourths of a seer ($1\frac{1}{2}$ lb.) of grain per head per day, according to the calculations given by Mr. A. P. Macdonnel in his "Food Grain Supply and Famine Relief in Behar and Bengal" (p. 8), or, say, 550 lbs. per annum per head of agricultural population, and allowing $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the gross produce for seed, an equal quantity for cattle-feed, and 2 per cent. for waste, or together 15 per cent., the value of the surplus

* There was an error in my table; this amount should be Rs. 27,72,56,263—D. N.

agricultural produce is sufficient to yield Rs. 24 per head per annum for other requirements, and Rs. 22 per head after deduction of the land revenue demand, or, say, 8*l.* 16*s.* per annum per family of four persons.

The other population of the Punjab (omitting Native States) numbers 7,921,848, for whom the remaining food grain grown, after allowing for the food of agriculturists, cattle, seed, waste, &c., amounting to 5,401,151,059 lbs., is sufficient to provide them with an average rate of over 600 lbs. per head per annum. To supply them with 550 lbs. per head per annum would take 4,357,016,400 lbs., leaving a surplus of 1,044,134,659 lbs., or over 450,000 tons, for export. The food grain grown in the Punjab is, therefore, apart from other food supplies, more than sufficient to feed the whole population, and it is well known that considerable quantities of wheat are exported thence.

The numbers engaged in manufactures in the Punjab I have stated to be about 4,500,000. The net value of manufactures, after deducting the value of raw material, is given by Mr. Dadabhai as only Rs. 4,08,40,058, or about Rs. 9 per head per annum of the population engaged therein. This, I think, sufficiently shows that there must be some error in the value given.

F. C. DANVERS.

India Office, 28th June, 1880.

32, Great St. Helens, London,
12th August, 1880.

SIR LOUIS MALLET, *the Under Secretary of State for India*,
India Office, London, S.W.

SIR,—I have received your letter of the 9th inst., and I tender my sincere thanks to his Lordship the Secretary of State for India for the kind attention he has given to my letter of the 24th May last, and for forwarding it to the Government of India.

The necessity for having correct information about the material condition of India is so very great, both to the rulers and the subjects, that I venture to say that any reasonable and well-directed expenditure for this object would be productive of great good; and that, therefore, the Government of India may be requested to improve the existing machinery as much as it may be needed to obtain from the different Governments the tables of production and consumption with as much approximate accuracy as possible. The tables, even so far as are at present supplied, are useful, and I cannot think that it would be difficult for the different Governments to improve the existing arrangements, so as to get sufficiently approximate results for the guidance of the legisla-

tion and administration of the country with the greatest practical good, and without the commission of such mistakes as are unavoidably made in the ignorance of the actual state and wants of the country.

For Bengal, also, I hope some means may be devised to obtain such information.

It does not remain for me now, with the evidence of your present letter and its enclosures before me, to impress upon the India Office the great importance of these statistics; for I find that when I commenced working at these tables, about the beginning of last year, the India Office had already got these very tables prepared for their use, and I cannot but express my gladness to find such to be the case.

I am sorry I am not at present well able to give such attention to the enclosures of your letter as I desire, as I am not in good health and am under medical treatment.

I remain,

Your obedient servant,

DADABHAI NAOROJI.

32, Great St. Helens, London,

13th September, 1880.

SIR LOUIS MALLET, *the Under Secretary of State for India, India Office, London, S.W.*

SIR,—In continuation of my letter of 12th ult., I now beg to submit, for the consideration of his Lordship the Secretary of State for India, the accompanying memorandum on Mr. Danvers' two papers of 4th January, 1879, and 28th June, 1880, and I hope his Lordship will give it the same kind attention that was shown to my former letter.

I request that copy of this letter and memo. be sent to the Indian Government, as I think that views similar to those of Mr. Danvers more or less prevail in India also.

I shall esteem it a great favour if it is pointed out to me that I am mistaken in any of my views now put forth. My only desire is to find out the truth, and that India may receive and enjoy the blessings and benefits which the British nation is really capable of bestowing on her, if once British statesmen give their usual conscientious attention to her concerns.

I remain, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

DADABHAI NAOROJI.

*Memorandum on Mr. Danvers' Papers of 28th June, 1880, and
4th January, 1879.*

Mr. Danvers says: "In examining Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's paper, it appears that in his calculations he has omitted to make any allowance for the value of straw, and he has made no attempt to estimate the value of the increase of agricultural stock, but he has added an arbitrary sum for the latter and for other omitted items."

I have omitted not only straw, but also grass, cotton seed, and any fodder or other food for animals which I have not taken in my tables; and further, I should also omit all that portion of the inferior grains which I have shown in my table at page 127—of about 30 per cent. of the whole acreage of grains, and which is grown for the food of animals.

The reason is this: the principle to be considered is—first, either the whole *gross* annual production of the country may be taken (including straw, grass, &c., &c.), and from this *gross* production, before apportioning it per head of human population, a deduction should be made for the portion required for all the stock, which, in the case of the Punjab, are above 7,000,000 large cattle and near 4,000,000 sheep and goats; or, second, all straw, grass, and every production raised for animal food should be left out of calculation, and only the rest of the production which is and can be turned to human use should be apportioned among the human population. Mr. Danvers may adopt either of the above two methods, whichever he may consider would give most correctly the actual production for human use. It would not be correct to include the produce raised for animal use, and then not to make the necessary deduction for such use. I would put this matter in another form.

Suppose on the 1st of January, 1880, we have in India a certain amount of material wealth in all its various forms, and we take complete stock of it; that during the year following the country works in all its varieties of ways, consumes for all its various human, animal, and instrumental wants from the store existing on the 1st January, 1880; and that after the end of the year, on 1st January, 1881, we gather together or take stock of every possible kind of material production (agricultural, mineral, and manufacturing, and addition from profits of foreign trade) during the year. This production during the year will have to meet all the wants of the next year. If this production prove less than what would be wanted for the next year, then there would be a deficiency, and either the original wealth or capital of the country will have to be drawn upon, or the people will be so much less supplied with their wants in some shape or other; in either way showing a diminution of prosperity, both as property and capacity. If, on the other hand, the whole material production of

the year prove more than what would be necessary for the next year for all ordinary or usual wants, then a surplus would accrue, and so far, in some permanent form, add to the capital of the country and increase its prosperity.

I request, therefore, that Mr. Danvers may be asked to work out the total production and wants of India, for, say, the last dozen years, on correct principles of calculation, from such materials as are already available at the India Office, supplementing such information as may be deficient by asking from India and from experienced retired officials who are now in this country. Such tables will show what the actual material condition of the country is, and whether it is increasing or diminishing in prosperity. Unless such information is obtained, the Government of the country will be blind and in the dark, and cannot but result in misery to India, and discredit to the rulers, their best intentions notwithstanding. It is hopeless to expect intelligent government without the aid of such important information annually.

I am glad Mr. Danvers has made an estimate of the annual increase of agricultural stock in his paper of 4th January, 1879, and as I have to say something upon this paper further on, I do not say anything here upon the subject of stock.

Mr. Danvers says: "Mr. Dadabhai has adopted the principle of equally apportioning the value of agricultural produce and manufactures, as ascertained by him from the statistics available, amongst the whole population, without distinguishing how many are agriculturists, how many mechanics, and how many belong to other trades or professions, or possess property, and whose incomes, therefore, are derived directly neither from agriculture nor from manufactures. Thus he omits all reference to railway wealth, Government stock, house property, profits of trade, salaries, pensions, non-agricultural wages, professional incomes, and returns to investments, and all other sources from which a man who does not grow food himself may obtain the means of purchasing it."

"From the Census Report of 1871, it appears that, out of a total population of 17,611,498 under British administration in the Punjab, 9,689,650 are returned as agriculturists, 1,776,786 adult males, equivalent to about 4,500,000 of population, as engaged in industrial occupations; thus leaving a population of nearly 3,500,000 directly dependent neither upon agriculture, manufactures, nor mining, and who must therefore derive their means of subsistence from other sources."

I take each of the items:—

1st, "Railway Wealth." I am not sure what Mr. Danvers means by "railway wealth." In his paper of 4th January, 1879,

he regards railways as "enhancing the value of food grains, and adding, *pro tanto*, to the wealth of the districts through which they run." If he means in the above extract, by "railway wealth," something different, then that needs to be explained. In the meantime, I adopt the interpretation as I make out with the aid of his paper of 4th January, 1879.

Suppose 100 maunds of wheat exist in the Punjab, and its cost to the producer, say, is Rs. 100—suppose that this wheat is carried by railway to Bombay, and its value at Bombay is Rs. 125; does Mr. Danvers mean that this circumstance has *added* Rs. 25, or anything at all, to the existing wealth of India?

If so, then no such thing has happened. The 100 maunds of wheat existed in the Punjab, and the Rs. 125 existed in Bombay, before the wheat was moved an inch. After the movement, the only result has been change of hands. The wheat has gone to Bombay, and the Rs. 125 are distributed between the owner at Punjab, who receives Rs. 100, and the railway owners and workers, and the merchant who carried through the transaction, who between them divide the Rs. 25. By the mere fact of the removal of the wheat from the Punjab to Bombay, not a single grain of wheat nor a single pie of money is *added* to what already existed in India before the wheat was touched. Such "railway wealth" does not exist. If the mere movement of produce can *add* to the existing wealth, India can become rich in no time. All it would have to do is to go on moving its produce continually all over India, all the year round, and under the magic wheels of the train, wealth will go on springing till the land will not suffice to hold it. But there is no royal (even railway) road to material wealth. It must be produced from the materials of the earth, till the great discovery is made of converting motion into matter. I should not be misunderstood. I am not discussing here the benefits of railways, whatever they are, to any country or to India. To show that the people of India are not deriving the usual benefits of railways, I give hereafter a short separate section. Here it is enough for me to state that railways are, in a way, an indirect means of increasing the material production of any country, but that, whatever that "means" is, its result is fully and completely included in the estimate of the actual annual production of the country, and that there is nothing more to be *added* to such actual material production of the year.

2nd, "Government Stock." Suppose I hold a lakh of rupees of Government 4 per cent. rupee paper. It does not from itself produce or create or make to grow out any money or food or any kind of material wealth for me. It simply means that Government will give me Rs. 4,000 every year, and that, not by creating anything by any divine power, but

from the revenue of the country ; and this revenue can be got from only the actual material production of the year. So, in reality, my income of Rs. 4,000 from "Government Stock" is nothing more nor less than a share out of the production of the country, and is therefore fully and completely included therein. No addition has to be made from "Government Stock" to the actual material production of the year. No such addition exists at all.

3rd, "House Property." Suppose I have taken a house at a yearly rental of Rs. 1,000. The house does not grow or create the rent by the mere fact of my occupying it. I have to pay this amount out of my income of Rs. 4,000 from Government Stock, and so the house-owner receives through me and the Government his share out of the production of the country. The discussion of the other items further on will show that, be my income from any of the various sources Mr. Danvers suggests, it is ultimately and solely derived from, and is included in, the yearly production of the country, and the owners of "house property" simply take their share, like everybody else, from this same store.

4th, "Profits of Trade." I take, first, foreign trade. Mr. Danvers is quite right that the foreign trade of a country adds to its annual income or production.* But, unfortunately, the case with India is quite otherwise. The present system of British administration not only sweeps away to England the whole profits of the foreign trade, but also drains away a portion of the annual production itself of the country. So that, instead of India making *any* addition from its "profits of foreign trade" to its yearly production, a deduction has to be made from such production in estimating the actual quantity that ultimately remains for the use of the people of India. A portion of the actual production, through the channel of foreign trade, goes clean out of the country to England, without an atom of material return. The manner in which the foreign trade of India becomes the channel through which India's present greatest misfortune and evil operate, I treat further on in a separate section, to avoid confusion. It is enough for me to say here that, as matters actually stand, instead of there being, as should be, any addition from foreign trade to the annual production of India, there is actually a diminution, or drain of it clean out of the country to England, to the extent of some 18,000,000*l.* a year, together with, and over and above, all its "profits of trade." I grieve, therefore, that I have nothing to *add* from "profits of trade," as Mr. Danvers suggests, but much to *subtract*.

* Taking the aggregate wealth of the world, foreign trade even adds nothing. It simply then becomes internal trade, and is mere change of hands, as explained further on.

I take next the internal trade. Resuming the illustration of the 100 maunds of wheat at Punjab, say a merchant buys at Rs. 100 and sends it to Bombay, where he gets Rs. 125. The result simply is, that the wheat is still the same 100 maunds, and the Rs. 125 that existed in Bombay are still Rs. 125, but that out of Rs. 25 the merchant receives his "profit of trade," and the railway its charges for carrying. Not a single atom of money or wheat is added to the existing wealth of the country by this internal trade; only a different distribution has taken place. I should not be misunderstood. I am not discussing here the usefulness of internal trade, whatever it is; I am only pointing out that any increase in the material income of the country by the mere transactions of the internal trade is a thing that does not exist, and that whatever benefits and "profits of trade" there are from internal trade, are fully and completely included in the ultimate result of the actual material production of the year.

5th, "Salaries and Pensions." These will be official and non-official. Official salaries and pensions are paid by Government from revenue, and this revenue is derived from the production of the country; and so from that same store are all such salaries and pensions derived. For non-official salaries or pensions the phenomenon is just the same. I pay my clerks or servants either from my profits of trade, or interest of Government Stock, or from rent of my house property, or from any of the sources which Mr. Danvers may suggest, but one and all of these incomes are drawn from the same store,—the annual material production of the country. All salaries and pensions are thus fully and completely included in the estimate of the production.

But this is not all. In these salaries and pensions, &c., do we come to the very source of India's chief misfortune and evil, which, as I have already said, works through the medium of the foreign trade. It is the salaries and pensions, and all other expenditure incident to the excessive European agency, both in England and India, which is India's chief curse, in the shape of its causing the exhausting drain which is destroying India. In the ordinary and normal circumstances of a country, when all the salaries, pensions, &c., are earned by the people themselves, and remain in the country itself to fructify in the people's own pockets, there is no such thing as an addition to the annual production of the country from "salaries and pensions." But as far as India is concerned, the case is much worse. All salaries and pensions, &c., paid to Europeans in England and India, beyond the absolute necessity of the maintenance or supervision of British rule, are actually, first, a direct deprivation of the natural provision for similar classes of the people of the country, and, second, a drain from the property and capacity of the country at large.

So, unfortunately, is there nothing to be *added*, as Mr. Danvers asks, from "salaries and pensions," but much to be *subtracted*, that is either spent in England or remitted to England from the resources of India, and for which not a particle returns, and what is enjoyed in India itself by the Europeans.

Mr. Danvers may kindly consider his own salary. It is derived from the production of India. It is brought to England, and not a farthing out of it returns to India. Even if it returned, it would be no *addition* to the wealth of India; but as it does not return, it is so much actual *diminution* from the means of the subsistence of the people. I should not be misunderstood. That for a good long time a reasonable amount of payment for British rule is necessary for the regeneration of India is true, and no thinking Native of India denies this. It is the evil of excessive payment that India has to complain of. But what I have to point out here is that salaries and pensions, even to the Natives themselves, are no addition to the wealth, and much less are those which are not paid to the people of the country. The increase supposed by Mr. Danvers does not exist. There is, on the contrary, much diminution.

6th, "Non-Agricultural Wages." A person employed by a farmer, say as a labourer, upon building his house, is paid from the farmer's agricultural income. A person employed by a merchant, a householder, a stockholder, a pensioner, or a salaried man, or on a railway, is paid from their income, which, as I have explained, is derived from the only great store—the annual material production of the country. In short, every labourer—mental or physical—has his share for his subsistence, through various channels, from the only one fountain-head—the annual material production of the country. There is no source outside the production (including any addition to it from profits of foreign trade) from which any individual derives his means of subsistence.

7th, "Professional Incomes." I consult a doctor or a solicitor. The mere act of my consulting these professional gentlemen does not enable me to create money to pay them. I must pay them from my income as an agriculturist, or aminer, or a manufacturer, or a stockholder, or a householder, &c.; and my such income is all and solely derived from the material production of the country.

I need not now go any further into a repetition of the same argument with regard to—

8th, "Returns to investments, and all other sources from which a man who does not grow food himself may obtain the means of purchasing it;" or leaving a population "directly dependent neither upon agriculture, manufactures, nor mining, and who must therefore derive their means of subsistence from other sources."

There *do not exist* any such "other sources," except profits of foreign trade. But, unfortunately for India, instead of foreign trade bringing any profits, it is actually the channel by which, in addition to all such profits, a portion of the production itself is also swept away. So India exhibits the strange phenomenon, that her people cannot get any benefit from profits of foreign trade, and cannot enjoy for their subsistence even their own production, fully or adequately. The result of all the different influences—forces, labour, knowledge, land, climate, railways, or all other kinds of public works, good government, justice, security of property, law, order—and all the above eight and other so-called sources of income, is *fully and completely* comprised in the *ultimate resultant* of all of them—viz., the actual material income of the year. Its increase or decrease every year is, in fact, *the* test of the ultimate and full result of all the above direct and indirect means of the production of a country. If the material income of the year does not suffice for all the wants of the whole people for the year, the existing "capital"-wealth of the country is drawn upon, and, so far, the capital and the capacity for annual production are diminished.

I submit, therefore, that Mr. Danvers' argument of the "other sources" has to be laid aside.

Mr. Danvers says: "Mr. Dadabhai makes out the total value of the agricultural produce of the Punjab to be Rs. 27,72,56,263, and that "from manufactures and mines, Rs. 4,11,40,058. To this he adds, to "meet any omissions, a further margin of $3\frac{1}{2}$ crores, making the whole "produce of the Punjab $35\frac{1}{2}$ crores of rupees, 'which, for a population of "17,600,000, gives Rs. 20 per head per annum at the outside for the year "'1876-7,' to which year the figures he has taken refer. At page 148 of "his tables he shows that the cost of absolute necessities of life of an "agricultural labourer is Rs. 34 per annum, but he omits to explain how, "under these circumstances, the people of the Punjab managed to live, "and leaves the reader to draw his own conclusions how, with only Rs. 20 "per annum, he can provide for an expenditure of Rs. 34."

Why, that is the very question I want Government to answer: How can they expect people to manage to live, under such circumstances, without continuously sinking into poverty? The first real question is, Are these facts or not? If not, then what are the actual facts of the "means and wants" of the people of India? If they are, then the question is for Mr. Danvers and Government to answer, how people can manage to live. The answer to the question is, however, obvious—viz., that as the balance of income every year available for the use of the people of India does not suffice for the wants of the year, the capital-wealth of the country is being drawn upon, and the country goes on

becoming poorer and poorer, and more and more weakened in its capacity of production; and that the American War, for a little while, gave, and the various loans give, a show of prosperity, to end in greater burdens and greater destruction by famines.

These facts of the insufficiency of the means for the wants go to prove the late Lord Lawrence's statements, made in 1864, as Viceroy, and, in 1873, before the Finance Committee. In 1864, he said that India was, on the whole, a very poor country, and the mass of the people enjoyed only a scanty subsistence; and, in 1873, he repeated that the mass of the people of India were so miserably poor that they had barely the means of subsistence; that it was as much as a man could do to feed his family, or half feed them, let alone spending money on what might be called luxuries or conveniences. Such, then, is the manner in which the people of India manage to live: scanty subsistence, and dying away by millions at the very touch of drought. In the case of the Punjab, as the latest British possession, and least drained, and from other circumstances noted below,* the people have had, as yet, better resources, in their "capital"-wealth, to draw upon; but taking India as a whole, Lord Lawrence's words are, most deplorably, but too true.

I need not discuss Mr. Danvers' paper of 28th June, 1880, any further. The fallacy of "other sources," besides agriculture, mines, manufactures, and foreign trade, pervades his whole argument; and in the latter part of the paper two different matters are mixed up, a little misapprehension has taken place as to my meaning, and some part is irrelevant.

The whole question now before us is simply this:—

First, what the whole actual, material, annual income of India is,

* The Punjab is favoured by nature and by circumstances. By nature, inasmuch as it is one of the most fertile parts of India. It is "Punjab," the land of the five waters, and it has both natural and artificial irrigation. It is favoured by circumstances, inasmuch as that (excepting Bengal, in its special fortunate circumstances of the permanent settlement) Punjab pays the least land revenue—viz., the Punjab pays Re. 1-2-2 per head per annum, the North-west Provinces pay Re. 1-6, Madras Re. 1-7, and Bombay Rs. 2-4-3 (see my tables, page 141). I have taken these figures for 1875-6; those for 1876-7 would be unfair and abnormal, on account of the Bombay and Madras Famines. Further, the Punjab has been further favoured by other circumstances in the following way:—

The Administration Report of 1856-8 says: "In former Reports it was explained how the circumstance of so much money going out of the Punjab contributed to depress the agriculturists. The Native regular army was Hindustani; to them was a large share of the Punjab revenue disbursed, of which a part only was spent on the spot, and a part was remitted to their homes. Thus it was that, year after year, lakhs and lakhs were drained from the Punjab, and enriched Oudh. But within the last year, the Native army being Punjabi, all such sums have been paid to them, and

as the ultimate balance of all sources and influences, that is available for the use of the whole *people of India* ;

Secondly, what the absolutely necessary wants and the usual wants of all classes of the people are ; and

Thirdly, whether the income of India is equal to, less, or more than such wants.

By carefully ascertaining these facts every year, shall we ever be able to know truly whether India is progressing in prosperity, or sinking in poverty, or is in a stationary condition. This is the whole problem, and it must be boldly faced and clearly answered if the mission of Britain is the good of India, as I firmly believe it to be.

As to the question, how and by whom, directly or indirectly, the income is actually produced, and how and by whom, and through what channels, this income is distributed among the whole people, that is an entirely different matter, and, though important in itself and involving much legislation, is quite separate from the first and fundamental question of the whole total of the means and wants of India.

I may explain the misapprehension to which I alluded above. In my tables for consumption, in taking "the cost of absolute necessities" of life of an agricultural labourer," I meant him as merely representing the lowest class of labourers of all kinds, so as to show the lowest absolutely necessary wants of the people.

I am under the impression that there is a Statistical Committee at Calcutta, which has existed for the past twenty years, and I hope it will adopt means to give complete tables of the wants and means of India.

As I am requesting his Lordship the Secretary of State for India that Mr. Danvers be asked to work out the wants and means of the people of India during the last twelve years, and that the Government of India may adopt means to perfect the machinery for getting complete information for the future, I submit a few remarks on Mr. Danvers' tables of January 4, 1879, so kindly sent to me. As I have my Punjab tables only for comparison, I examine Mr. Danvers' Punjab tables only.

In his table of quantities of all the inferior grains Mr. Danvers has taken the crop per acre of only some of the grains whose average is have been spent at home. Again, many thousands of Punjabi soldiers are serving abroad; these men not only remit their savings, but have also sent a quantity of prize property and plunder—the spoils of Hindustan—to their native villages. The effect—
"of all this is already perceptible in an increase of agricultural capital, a freer circulation of money, and a fresh impetus to cultivation."

It will be seen that the Punjab has more capital to draw upon, and has some addition to its resources at the expense of the other provinces, to make up for some of its deficiency of production.

510 lbs. per acre. But the produce of makai and gram, which are included by Mr. Danvers in the inferior grains, is larger, and the result is a large error. The acreage of makai is 1,084,339 acres, and the average produce per acre is 1,500 lbs., so that this produce is under-estimated to the extent of taking only about one-third of the actual quantity. The average produce of gram is 645 lbs. per acre, and the acreage is 2,272,236 acres. On this large acreage there is nearly 26 per cent. of under-estimate. The result of the whole error in the table of inferior grains is that the total quantity is taken by Mr. Danvers as 6,504,880,162 lbs., when it actually is 7,371,110,343 lbs., or above 866,200,000 lbs. more.

In the prices of inferior grains it is necessary to make proper allowance for the lower prices of such grains as moth, kangni, chiná, matar, and masur, which are nearly 25 per cent. lower than the other grains—jowár, bájrá, másh, mung, and arhar. This makes an over-estimate of 240,000%. The prices for makai, jow, and gram are given in the Report, and separate estimates should, therefore, be made of the values of these grains, to obtain all possible approximation to truth and accuracy.

The total under-estimate by Mr. Danvers is 1,300,000% in the value of inferior grains.

In "other crops" the value assumed by Mr. Danvers is nearly only one-fourth of what I make, by taking every item separately—i.e., I make Rs. 19,16,294 against Mr. Danvers' Rs. 4,73,200.

In the following articles Mr. Danvers has adopted the average given in the Report, which, as pointed out by me on previous occasions, is taken on the fallacious principle of adding up the produce per acre of the districts and dividing by the number of districts, without any reference to the quantity of acreage of each district.

Produce.	Incorrect Average.	Correct Average.	Error.	
			Correct Average.	
			More per cent.	Less per cent.
Vegetables	4,008	4,753	18½	...
Sugar*	449	646	44	...
Cotton*	102	105	3	...
Tobacco	825	846	2½	...
Fibres	322	366	13¾	...
Indigo	47	31	...	33
Opium	10	12½	25	...

* As to some probable errors in these two articles in the Report, I have already given my views in my tables.

In the case of indigo, cotton, tobacco, and hemp, the error has not been large, as the incorrect average is adopted by Mr. Danvers for a few districts only. I notice such differences as $2\frac{1}{2}$ and 3 per cent. also, because, in dealing with figures of hundreds and thousands of millions, these percentages, singly as well as collectively, seriously disturb the accuracy of results. It is very necessary to avoid, as much as possible, all *avoidable* errors, large or small, so that then reliance can be placed upon the results.

The Report gives the price of first sort sugar only, but which, applied to the whole quantity of all kinds, makes the value of nearly two-thirds of the whole quantity quite two and a-half times greater than it actually is; the over-estimate comes to nearly 1,800,000*l*.

The price of indigo, as ascertained by me (Rs. 60 per maund), is nearly 20 per cent. higher than that assumed by Mr. Danvers (Rs. 50 per maund).

Mr. Danvers has taken a seer = 2 lbs., when in reality it is nearly 6 per cent. of a pound larger, which becomes a serious error in the large amounts to be dealt with.

Mr. Danvers has adopted the prices of 1st January, 1877, only, instead of taking an average of the prices of the four periods given in the Report, to represent the whole year.

In his remarks at page 16, Mr. Danvers makes no allowance for seed, which is an important item. He includes straw, all inferior grains, and cotton seed, and yet makes no allowance at all for the feed of animals (some 7,000,000 large cattle and near 4,000,000 sheep and goats) before apportioning the produce per human head. Grass being not taken, makes some allowance for animals so far.

I cannot say on what grounds (page 16) 4 per cent. is assumed for annual increase of large cattle, and 15 per cent. of sheep and goats. I have not got the Report for 1878-9, when the next quinquennial enumeration of stock must have been made, but on comparing the numbers of the last two enumerations of 1868-9 and 1873-4, the result is as follows :—

	1868-9.	1873-4.	Increase.	Decrease.	Per Cent.
Cows, Bullocks, and Buffaloes*	6,797,561	6,570,212	...	227,349	$3\frac{1}{2}$
Horses	96,226	84,639	...	11,587	12
Ponies ..	51,302	51,395	93
Donkeys	257,615	288,118	30,503	...	11·8
Camels	148,582	165,567	16,985	...	11·4
Total.....	7,351,286	7,159,931	=	191,355	...
Sheep and Goats.....	3,808,819	3,849,842	46,023	...	14

* In the Report of 1868-9 the heading is only "cows and bullocks," while in

From this comparison it appears that in the important items of cows, bullocks, and buffaloes, instead of any increase, there is actually a decrease of 227,349, or $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., during the five years. In horses, also, there is a decrease of about $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. every year, instead of 4 per cent. increase. In ponies the increase is hardly $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in five years, in donkeys about 11 per cent., and in camels about 11 per cent. in all the five years, or about $2\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. per year, instead of 4 per cent. In sheep and goats the increase is hardly $1\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. in five years, instead of 15 per cent. per year. For cows and bullocks, and sheep and goats, there is one allowance to be made—viz., for what are killed for food. To make out the increase in cows, &c., of 4 per cent. every year, nearly $4\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. must have been killed every year for food, and for sheep and goats the percentage of killed should be nearly $14\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. per annum. Is it so?

Mr. Danvers has assumed ghi produced in the Punjab to be four times as much as imported (52,303 maunds) into it, and he thus makes the quantity produced to be 209,212 maunds. Now the value of the imported ghi is also given in the Report as Rs. 9,64,028, which, taken four times, would be 385,611*l*. But Mr. Danvers has overlooked this actual price, and adopted the fallacious average of the table of prices in the Report, which makes the price 1*s*. 12*c*. per rupee. At this incorrect price the value will be 478,198*l*., or nearly 25 per cent. more than the actual value given in the Report. But not only has there been this incorrect increase thus made, but, by some arithmetical mistake, the value put down by Mr. Danvers is above three times as much as even this increased amount—i.e., instead of 478,198*l*., Mr. Danvers has put down 1,501,096*l*. If this be not merely an arithmetical mistake, it requires explanation.

Mr. Danvers has taken the import of ghi from "foreign trade" only, and has overlooked a further quantity of import, "inter-provincially," of 16,312 maunds, of the value of 34,741*l*., which, taken four times, would be 138,964*l*., making up the total value of the assumed produce of ghi in the Punjab to be 385,611*l*. + 138,964*l*. = 524,575*l*.

Working upon Mr. Danvers' own assumption, and what information I have been at present able to obtain, it appears that the assumption of four times the import, or 525,000*l*., will be an under-estimate by a good deal. I am not at present able to test the accuracy of Mr. Danvers' assumption of the produce of milk, nor of the information

1876-7, it is given as "cows, bullocks, and buffaloes." Now if buffaloes are not included in 1868-9, the diminution in cattle will be *very* much larger. Most probably, buffaloes are included in 1868-9 figures. But this must be ascertained. It is a serious matter.

I am using below, but I give it just as I have it, to illustrate the principle. I adopt Mr. Danvers' assumption of 10 per cent. of the whole cattle to be milch-animals. The number then will be 657,000. Of these, cows may be taken, I am told by a Punjabi, as 75 per cent., and buffaloes 25 per cent. This will give 164,250 buffaloes and 492,750 cows. Each buffalo may be taken, on an average, as giving six seers of milk per day for six months in the year, and each cow about three seers. The quantity of milk will then be—

$$164,250 \times 6 \text{ seers} \times 180 \text{ days} = 177,390,000 \text{ seers.}$$

$$492,750 \times 3 \text{ seers} \times 180 \text{ days} = 266,085,000 \text{ seers.}$$

$$\text{Total ... } 443,475,000 \text{ seers.}$$

Mr. Danvers assumes for milk used in the province to be about Rs. 10 per annum from each of the 10 per cent. of the cattle, and, taking the price of milk to be 16 seers per rupee, the quantity of milk used would be $657,000 \times 160 = 105,120,000$ seers. This, deducted from the above total produce of milk, will give $(443,475,000 - 105,120,000)$ 338,355,000 seers as converted into ghi. The produce of ghi is about $\frac{1}{8}$ th to $\frac{1}{12}$ th of milk, according to quality. Assuming $\frac{1}{12}$ th as the average, the total quantity of ghi will be about 28,196,250 seers = 704,906 maunds, or, allowing a little for wastage, say 700,000 maunds, which, at the import price (Rs. 13,11,445 for 68,615 maunds) of Rs. 19 per maund, will give about 1,339,300L, or nearly $2\frac{1}{4}$ times as much as Mr. Danvers has assumed. I have endeavoured in a hurry to get this information as well as I could, but it can be obtained correctly by the officials on the spot. My object at present is simply to show, that calculated on Mr. Danvers' assumption of milch-cattle and milk used, how much ghi should be produced in the country, if the information I have used be correct.

For hides and skins the export only is taken into account, but a quantity must be consumed in the province itself, which requires to be added.

The value assumed, Rs. 100 per horse, is rather too high. Rs. 60 or Rs. 70, I am told, would be fairer; so also for ponies, Rs. 25 to Rs. 30 instead of Rs. 35; and camels, Rs. 60 or Rs. 70 or Rs. 75 instead of Rs. 100. For sheep, &c., Rs. $1\frac{1}{2}$ instead of Re. 1 would be fairer.

But, as I have said above, officials in India can give all this information correctly for every year, and I do not see any reason why this should not be done. I urgently repeat my request that the wants and means of the last twelve or fifteen years may be ordered by his Lordship the Secretary of State to be carefully worked out, as far as practicable, and that future Reports should be required to give complete information.

RAILWAYS.

I may take railways to represent public works. The benefits generally derived from railways are these: they distribute the produce of the country from parts where it is produced, or is in abundance, to the parts where it is wanted, so that no part of the produce is wasted, which otherwise would be the case if no facility of communication existed. In thus utilizing the whole produce of the country, the railway becomes directly a saving agent, and indirectly thereby helps in increasing the production of the country.

It brings the produce to the ports at the least possible cost for exportation and commercial competition for foreign trade, and thus indirectly helps in obtaining the profits of foreign trade, which are an increase to the annual income of a country.

Every country, in building railways, even by borrowed capital, derives the benefit of a large portion of such borrowed capital, as the capital of the country, which indirectly helps in increasing the production of the country. Excepting interest paid for such borrowed capital to the foreign lending country, the rest of the whole income remains *in the country*.

But the result of *all* the above benefits from railways is ultimately realized and comprised in the actual annual income of the country.

The misfortune of India is that she does not derive the above benefits, as every other country does.

You build a railway in England, and, say, its gross income is a million. All the employés, from the chairman down to the common labourer, are *Englishmen*. Every farthing that is spent from the gross income is so much returned to *Englishmen*, as direct maintenance to so many people of *England*, and to *England* at large, as a part of its general wealth. Whether the shareholders get their 5 per cent., or 10 per cent., or 1 per cent., or 0 per cent., or even lose, it matters not at all to the whole country. Every farthing of the income of the million is fully and solely enjoyed by *the people of the country*, excepting only (if you borrowed a portion of the capital from foreign parts) the interest you may pay for such loan. But such interest forms a small portion of the whole income, and every country with good railways can very well afford to pay. All the benefits of railways are thus obtained and enjoyed by *the people of the country*.

Take the case of the United States. India and the States are both borrowers for their railways (the latter only partially), and they both pay interest to the lending countries. They both buy, say, their rails, machinery, &c., from *England*, the States buying only a portion. So far, they are under somewhat similar circumstances; but here the

parallel ends. In the United States, every cent of the income of the railway (excepting the interest on the foreign loan) is the income of *the people of the country*—is a direct maintenance for the people employed on it, and an indirect property of the whole country, and remaining *in it*.

In India the case is quite different. First, for the directors, home establishments, Government superintendence, and what not, in England, a portion of the income must go from India; then a large European staff of employes (excepting only for inferior and lowest places or work left for Natives) must eat up and take away another large portion of the income, and to the rest the people of the country are welcome, with the result that, out of their production which they give to the railways, only a *portion* returns to them, and *not the whole*, as in all other countries (except interest on foreign loan), and the diminution lessens, so far, the capacity of production every year. Such expenditure, both in England and India, is so much direct deprivation of the natural maintenance of as many people of India of similar classes, and a loss to the general wealth and means of the people at large. Thus the whole burden of the debt is placed on the shoulders of the people of India, while the benefit is largely enjoyed and carried away by the people of England; and yet Englishmen raise up their hands in wonder why India should not be happy, pleased, and thankful! Some years ago, I asked Mr. J. Danvers to make a return, in his annual Railway Report, of the salaries and every other kind of disbursement on Europeans, both in England and India. If I remember rightly (I cannot just now lay my hands on the correspondence), he was kind enough to promise he would try. But I do not know that this information has been given. Let us have this information, and we shall then know why India does *not* derive the usual benefits from railways; how many Europeans displace as many Natives of the same class, and deprive them of their natural means of subsistence (some 3,600 in India, and all those in England), and what portion of the income the people of India do not see or enjoy a pie of.

Instead, therefore, of there being any "railway wealth" to be added to the annual production or income of India, it will be seen that there is much to be deducted therefrom to ascertain what *really* remains for the use of its own people; for the income of railways is simply a portion or share of the production of the country, and what is eaten up and taken away by Europeans is so much taken away from the means of the people.

It is no wonder at all that the United States have their 70,000 or more miles of railways, when India, under the *British Government*, with all its wonderful resources, with all that good government can do, and the whole British wealth to back, has hardly one-tenth of the length, and that even with no benefit to the people of the country. In short,

the fact of the matter is that, as India is treated at present, all the new departments, opened in the name of civilization, advancement, progress, and what not, simply resolve themselves into so much new provision for so many more Europeans, and so much new burden on exhausting India. We do pray to our British rulers, let us have railways and all other kinds of beneficial public works, by all means, but let *us* have their natural benefits, or talk not to a starving man of the pleasures of a fine dinner. We should be happy to, and thankfully, pay for such European supervision and guidance as may be absolutely necessary for successful work; but do not, in Heaven's and Honesty's names, talk to us of benefits which *we do not* receive, but have, on the contrary, to pay for from our own. If *we* are allowed to derive the usual benefits of railways and other public works, under such government as the British—of law, order and justice—we would not only borrow 200,000,000*l.*, but 2,000,000,000*l.* and pay the interest with as many thanks, with benefit both to our selves and to England, as India would then be her best and largest commercial customer.

The real important question, therefore, in relation to public works is, not how to stop them, but how to let *the people of the country* have their full benefits. One of the most important parts of England's great work in India is to develop these public works, but to the *people's* benefit, and not to their detriment—not that they should slave, and others eat.

FOREIGN TRADE.

Resuming our illustration of the 100 maunds of wheat from the Punjab, arriving at Bombay, costing to the Bombay merchant Rs. 125, we suppose that this merchant exports it to England. In ordinary course and natural conditions of trade, suppose the Bombay merchant, after two or three months, gets his net proceeds of Rs. 150 either in silver or as a bale of piece-goods, which could be sold at Bombay for Rs. 150. The result, then, of this "foreign trade" is that, before the wheat left Bombay, there were 100 maunds of wheat costing Rs. 125 at the time of export, and *after* the operation, India has either Rs. 150, or a bale of cotton goods worth Rs. 150. There is thus a clear "profit of trade" of Rs. 25, or, in other words, an addition of Rs. 25 worth, either in silver or goods, to the annual income or production of the country. This, in ordinary commercial language, would be: India exported value Rs. 125, in the shape of wheat, and imported value Rs. 150 in the shape of silver or merchandise, or both, making a trade profit of Rs. 25.

Under ordinary natural circumstances, such is the result of foreign trade to every country. I shall take the instance of the United Kingdom, and we may see what its ordinary foreign trade profits have been during a few past years—say, from 1871 to 1878.

PROFITS OF FOREIGN TRADE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

IMPORTS.				EXPORTS.					
Years.	Merchandise.	Treasure. (Gold and Silver.)	Total.	Years.	Merchandise.	Treasure. (Gold and Silver.)	Total.	Foreign Trade Profits.	Per Cent.
	£	£	£		£	£	£	£	
1871	331,015,480	38,140,827	369,156,307	1871	283,574,700	33,760,671	317,335,371	51,820,936	
1872	354,693,624	29,608,012	384,301,636	1872	314,588,834	30,335,861	344,924,695	39,376,941	
1873	371,287,372	33,599,231	404,886,603	1873	311,004,765	28,899,285	339,904,050	64,982,553	
1874	370,082,701	30,379,188	400,461,889	1874	297,650,464	22,853,593	320,504,057	79,957,832	
1875	373,939,577	33,264,789	407,204,366	1875	281,612,323	27,628,042	309,240,365	97,964,001	
1876	375,154,703	37,054,244	412,208,947	1876	256,776,602	29,464,082	286,240,684	125,968,263	
1877	394,419,682	37,152,799	431,572,481	1877	252,346,020	39,798,119	292,144,139	139,428,342	
1878	368,770,742	32,422,955	401,193,697	1878	245,483,858	26,686,546	272,170,404	129,023,293	
Grand Total.....			3,210,985,926	Grand Total.....			2,482,463,765	728,522,161	= 29.34

The result of the above table is, that during the eight years the United Kingdom has received as trade profits 29·34 per cent. This result requires the following further consideration. It includes the results of all money-trade or loans to and from foreign countries. Suppose England has lent 100,000,000*l.* to foreign countries; that forms a part of exports. Suppose it has received in interest, say, 5,000,000*l.*; that forms a part of the imports, and unless any portion of the principal of the loan is returned, the whole or balance (if a portion is paid) of the loan remains outstanding, and is so much more to be added to the above figure of trade profits. Again, there is the political profit from India of some 27,000,000*l.* a-year (as shown further on). That forms a part of the import, and has to be deducted from the figure of trade profits. England contributes to the expenses of the colonies. This is a part of its exports. Thus the formula will be :—

728,522,161*l.* + outstanding balance of loans of the eight years—the political drain from India to England (216,000,000*l.*) + contributions to the colonies = the actual profits of all commercial and monetary transactions with the world; or, in other words = the actual profits of the foreign trade of the eight years.

Now the figure 728,522,161*l.* is 29·34 per cent. The political drain of India forms nearly 9 per cent. out of this. There remains above 20 per cent. + the amounts of balance of loans and contributions to the colonies, as the actual rate of profits of the foreign trade of the United Kingdom.

I may fairly adopt this rate, of at least 20 per cent., for the profits of the foreign trade of India; but, to be quite under the mark, I adopt only 15 per cent.

Now we may see what actually happens to India, taking the same period of 1871—8.

The actual Exports (excluding Government Stores and

Treasure): Merchandise and Gold and Silver ...	= £485,186,749
Take Profits only 15 per cent.	= 72,778,012

The Imports as they <i>ought to be</i>	£557,964,761
--	--------------

Actual Imports (excluding Government Stores and Treasure): Merchandise and Gold and Silver.....	342,312,799
--	-------------

Deficit in Imports, or what is drained to England.....	215,651,962
--	-------------

(i.e., nearly 27,000,000*l.* a-year.)

Again taking actual Exports	485,186,749
-----------------------------------	-------------

And also actual Imports	342,312,799
-------------------------------	-------------

Abstraction from the *very produce* of the country

(besides the whole profits) is	= £142,873,950
--------------------------------------	----------------

in eight years, or nearly 18,000,000*l.* a-year, or 29·4 per cent.

Thus, with all the advantages of good government, law, order, justice, &c., railways, and every other influence of a civilized rule, the actual result is that not only does India *not* get a *single farthing* of the 15 or 20 per cent., or whatever it be, of the profits of her foreign trade, but actually has a further amount of nearly 30 per cent. of her exports kept away from her. This is not all. There is, moreover, the halter round her neck of the accumulated railway debt of nearly 100,000,000*l.*, held in England (from which her people have not derived the usual benefits), about 60,000,000*l.* of public debt (out of 134,000,000*l.*—mostly owing to wars) held in England, and 5,000,000*l.* spent in England on account of State public works. And yet Englishmen wonder why India is poor, and her finances inelastic! Good heavens! when will this bleeding to death end?

Keeping as much as possible on the right side, we find some 18,000,000*l.* from the production itself swept away from India, besides all her profits, and besides what Europeans enjoy in India itself, to the so much exclusion and deprivation of her own people. But this item of 18,000,000*l.* would be found much under the mark. For instance, all duty-articles imported into India are, I believe, valued at 10 per cent. more than their laying-down value. If so, roughly taken, the customs revenue being 2,500,000*l.*, represents roughly a duty at 5 per cent. on 50,000,000*l.*; and to make up this 50,000,000*l.*, with 10 per cent. extra, requires an addition to the actual value of imports of about 5,000,000*l.* If so, then there will be this much above 18,000,000*l.* taken away from the actual production of India, besides the whole trade profits, maintenance of Europeans in India, debts, &c.

The real abstraction from the very *produce* of the country is, most likely, much above 20,000,000*l.* a-year, and the whole loss above 30,000,000*l.* a-year, besides what is enjoyed in India itself by Europeans.

Under such circumstances, it is no wonder at all that famines and finance should become great difficulties, and that finance has been the grave of several reputations, and shall continue to be so till the discovery is made of making two and two equal to five, if the present unnatural treatment of India is to continue.

Far, therefore, from there being anything to be added to the annual income of India, as Mr. Danvers thinks, from the "profits of trade," there is the deplorable fact of much to be deducted in the case of India; and the consequences of such abstraction, in impoverishment and destruction by famines, &c., lay mostly at the door of the present unnatural policy of the British Administration. Let our rulers realize this fact intelligently, and face it boldly, in a way worthy of the British moral courage and character, and the whole scene will be entirely

changed—from deplorable poverty to prosperity, from the wail of woe to joy and blessing. Our misfortune is that the great statesmen of this country have not the necessary time to see into Indian matters, and things are allowed to drift blindly, or England would never become, as she unwittingly is at present, the destroyer of India. Her conscience is sound.

It is natural that in all discussions on finance, curtailment of expenditure and economy are, at first blush, recommended—to cut the coat according to cloth. But, unfortunately, no one asks the question why the cloth is short; why, under such rule as that of the English, India should not do well, if not quite as well as these islands, but should be only able to pay the wretched revenue of some 6s. a-head, and that even after “wringing out the last farthing.”

No doubt, vigilance for economy will always be a necessity in the best of states (not excepting England, as debates in Parliament testify) as long as the world lasts. But the real question, the most important question of all questions, at present is, not how to get 60,000,000*l.* or 100,000,000*l.*, for the matter of that, if that be necessary, but how to *return to the people* what is raised from them.

There is no reason whatever why India, with all her vast resources, the patient industry of the people, and the guidance and supervision of British high officials, should not be able to pay two or three times her present wretched revenue, say 100,000,000*l.* or 150,000,000*l.*, for efficient administration by her own people, under British supervision, and for the development of her unbounded material resources. Is it not unsatisfactory, or even humiliating, that British statesmen should have to confess that they have hopelessly to depend for about a sixth of the net revenue on supplying opium to another vast human race; and to ask despairingly what they were to do to get this amount of revenue from India itself? Then again, nearly as much more income has to be raised by an oppressive and heavy tax on salt; so that between a third and a fourth of the net revenue has to be derived—a part by pinching and starving the poor millions of India in one of the absolute necessities of life, and the other part by poisoning and demoralizing the millions of China. Surely, that a great people like the English, with their statesmanship of the highest order, and with all their genuine desire to do good to and to advance mankind, should not be able to get the necessary revenues from India, from her own healthy and natural prosperity, is a strange phenomenon in this advanced age.

Only restore India to her *natural* economical conditions. If, as in England, the revenue raised from the people *returned to the people*—if the income of railways and other public works taken from the people, re-

turned to the people, to fructify in their pockets, then would there be no need for anxiety for finance or famines, nor for pinching in salt, nor poisoning with opium, millions of the human race. India would then pay with ease 100,000,000*l.* or 200,000,000*l.* of revenue, and would not be the worse for it. It would be far better also, which would then be the case, that India should be able to purchase 1*l.* or 2*l.* worth a-head of British manufactures, and become England's best and largest customer, instead of the wretched one she is at present.

I repeat, therefore, with every earnestness, that the most important question of the day is, how to stop the bleeding drain from India. The merit or good of every remedy will depend upon and be tested by its efficacy in stopping this deplorable drain, without impairing the wants of the administration, or checking India's natural progress towards prosperity.

There is a deep conviction among educated and thoughtful Natives that if there is any one nation more than another on the face of the earth that would on no account knowingly do a wrong to or enslave, degrade, or impoverish a people, and who, on feeling the conviction of any injury having been unintentionally done by them, would at once, and at all reasonable sacrifice, repair the injury without shrinking, that nation is the British nation. This conviction keeps the thinking Natives staunch in their loyalty to the British rule. They know that a real regeneration, civilization, and advancement of India, materially, morally, and politically, depends upon a long continuance of the British rule. The peculiarly happy combination of high civilization, intense love of liberty, and nobility of soul in the British, cannot but lead them to the desire of the glory of raising a vast nation, instead of trampling upon them. This noble desire has found expression from some of their best men.

The English people have a task before them in India for which there is no parallel in the history of the world. There has not been a nation who, as conquerors, have, like the English, considered the good of the conquered as a duty, or felt it as their great desire; and the Natives of India may, with the evil of the present drain stopped, and a representative voice in their legislation, hopefully look forward to a future under the British rule which will eclipse their greatest and most glorious days.

May the light of Heaven guide our rulers!

DADABHAI NAOROJI.

32, Great St. Helens, London,
13th September, 1880.

India Office, S.W.,

15th October, 1880.

SIR,—I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 13th September, which, together with its enclosure, has been duly laid before the Secretary of State for India.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

LOUIS MALLET.

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji.

32, Great St. Helens, London,

16th November, 1880.

SIR LOUIS MALLET, *the Under-Secretary of State for India,*
India Office, London, S.W.

SIR,—Thanking you for your letter of 15th ultimo, informing me that my letter of 13th September, with enclosure, had been duly laid before his Lordship the Secretary of State for India, and hoping that the same kind attention will be given to it as to my previous letter, and that if I am wrong in any of my views I would be corrected, I beg to submit for his Lordship's kind and generous consideration the accompanying Memorandum No. 2, on the "Moral Poverty of India, and Native Thoughts on the British Indian Policy."

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

DADABHAI NAOROJI.

16th November, 1880.

MEMORANDUM No. 2.

The Moral Poverty of India, and Native Thoughts on the Present British Indian Policy.

In my last paper I confined myself to meeting Mr. Danvers' line of argument on the question of the material destruction and impoverishment of India by the present British Indian policy. I endeavoured to show that this impoverishment and destruction of India was mainly caused by the unnatural treatment it received at the hands of its British rulers, in the way of subjecting it to a large variety of expenditure upon a crushing foreign agency both in India and England, whereby the children of the country were displaced and deprived of their natural rights and means of subsistence in their own country; that, by what was being taken and consumed in India itself, and by what was being continuously taken away by such agency clean out of the country, an exhaustion of the very life-blood of the country was unceasingly going on; that not till this disastrous drain was duly checked, and not till the people

of India were restored to their natural rights in their own country, was there any hope for the material amelioration of India.

In this memorandum I desire to submit for the kind and generous consideration of his Lordship the Secretary of State for India, that from the same cause of the deplorable drain, besides the material exhaustion of India, the moral loss to her is no less sad and lamentable.

With the material wealth go also the wisdom and experience of the country. Europeans occupy almost all the higher places in every department of Government directly or indirectly under its control. While in India, they acquire India's money, experience, and wisdom; and when they go, they carry both away with them, leaving India so much poorer in material and moral wealth. Thus India is left without, and cannot have, those elders in wisdom and experience who in every country are the natural guides of the rising generations in their national and social conduct, and of the destinies of their country; and a sad, sad loss this is!

Every European is isolated from the people around him. He is not their mental, moral, or social leader or companion. For any mental or moral influence or guidance or sympathy with the people, he might just as well be living in the moon. The people know not him, and he knows not, nor cares for, the people. Some honourable exceptions do, now and then, make an effort to do some good they can, but in the very nature of things these efforts are always feeble, exotic, and of little permanent effect. These men are not always in the place, and their works die away when they go.

The Europeans are not the natural leaders of the people. They do not belong to the people; they cannot enter into their thoughts and feelings; they cannot join or sympathize with their joys or griefs. On the contrary, every day the estrangement is increasing. Europeans deliberately and openly widen it more and more. There may be very few social institutions started by Europeans in which Natives, however fit and desirous to join, are not deliberately and insultingly excluded. The Europeans are, and make themselves, strangers in every way. All they effectually do is to eat the substance of India, material and moral, while living there, and when they go, they carry away all they have acquired, and their pensions and future usefulness besides.

This most deplorable moral loss to India needs most serious consideration, as much in its political as in its national aspect. Nationally disastrous as it is, it carries politically with it its own Nemesis. Without the guidance of elderly wisdom and experience of their own natural leaders, the education which the rising generations are now receiving is naturally leading them (or call it misleading them, if you will) into direc-

tions which bode no good to the rulers, and which, instead of being the strength of the rulers, as it ought to be and can be, will turn out to be their great weakness. The fault will be of the rulers themselves for such a result. The power that is now being raised by the spread of education, though yet slow and small, is one that in time must, for weal or woe, exercise great influence; in fact, it has already begun to do so. However strangely the English rulers, forgetting their English manliness and moral courage, may, like the ostrich, shut their eyes, by gagging acts or otherwise, to the good or bad influences they are raising around them, this good or evil is rising nevertheless. The thousands that are being sent out by the universities every year find themselves in a most anomalous position. There is no place for them in their mother-land. They may beg in the streets or break stones on the roads, for aught the rulers seem to care for their natural rights, position, and duties in their own country. They may perish or do what they like or can, but scores of Europeans must go from this country to take up what belongs to them, and that in spite of every profession, for years and years past and up to the present day, of English statesmen, that they must govern India for India's good, by solemn Acts and declarations of Parliament, and, above all, by the words of the august Sovereign herself. For all practical purposes, all these high promises have been hitherto, almost wholly, the purest romance, the reality being quite different.

The educated find themselves simply so many dummies, ornamented with the tinsel of school-education, and then their whole end and aim of life is ended. What must be the inevitable consequence? A wild spirited horse, without curb or reins, will run away wild, and kill and trample upon every one that comes in his way. A misdirected force will hit anywhere, and destroy anything. The power that the rulers are, so far to their credit, raising will, as a Nemesis, recoil against themselves, if, with this blessing of education, they do not do their whole duty to the country which trusts to their righteousness, and thus turn this good power to their own side. The Nemesis is as clear from the present violence to nature, as disease and death arise from uncleanness and rottenness. The voice of the power of the rising education is, no doubt, feeble at present. Like the infant, the present dissatisfaction is only crying at the pains it is suffering. Its notions have not taken any form or shape or course yet, but it is growing. Heaven only knows what it will grow to! He who runs may see that if the present material and moral destruction of India continues, a great convulsion must inevitably arise, by which either India will be more and more crushed under the iron heel of despotism and destruction, or may succeed in shattering the destroying hand and power. Far, far is it from my earnest prayer and hope that

such should be the result of the British rule. In this rule there is every element to produce immeasurable good, both to India and England, and no thinking Native of India would wish harm to it, with all the hopes that are yet built upon the righteousness and conscience of the British statesmen and nation.

The whole duty and responsibility of bringing about this desired consummation lies upon the head and in the hands of the Indian authorities *in England*. It is no use screening themselves behind the fiction and excuse, that the Viceroy and authorities in India are difficult to be got to do what they ought, or that they would do all that may be necessary. They neither can nor will do this. They cannot go against Acts of Parliament on the one hand, and, on the other, the pressure of European interests, and of European selfishness and guidance, is so heavy in India, that the Viceroy in their first years are quite helpless, and get committed to certain courses; and if, in time, any of them, happening to have sufficient strength of character and confidence in their own judgment, are likely to take matters in their own hands, and, with any moral courage, to resist interests hostile or antagonistic to the good of the people, the end of their time begins to come near, their zeal and interest begin to flag, and soon they go away, leaving India to roll up Sisyphus's stone again, with a new Viceroy. It is the highest Indian authority here, the Secretary of State for India, upon whom the responsibility wholly rests. He alone has the power, as a member of and with the weight of the British Cabinet, to guide the Parliament to acts worthy of the English character, conscience, and nation. The glory or disgrace of the British in India is in his hands. He has to make Parliament lay down, by clear legislation, how India *shall* be governed for "*India's good*," or it is hopeless for us to look forward for any relief from our present material and moral destruction, and for future elevation.

Englishmen sometimes indulge the notion that England is secure in the division and disunion among the various races and nationalities of India. But even in this new forces are working their way. Those Englishmen who sleep such foolish sleep of security know very little of what is going on. The kind of education that is being received by thousands of all classes and creeds is throwing them all in a similar mould; a sympathy of sentiment, ideas, and aspirations is growing among them; and, more particularly, a political union and sympathy is the first-fruit of the new awakening, as all feel alike their deprivation, and the degradation and destruction of their country. All differences of race and religion, and rivalry, are gradually sinking before this common cause. This beginning, no doubt, is at present insignificant, but it is surely and steadily progressing. Hindus, Mahomedans, and Parsees are

alike asking, whether the English rule is to be a blessing or a curse. Politics now engross their attention more and more. This is no longer a secret, or a state of things not quite open to those of our rulers who would see. It may be seen that there is scarcely any union among the different nationalities and races in any shape or ways of life, except only in political associations. In these associations they go hand in hand, with all the fervour and sympathy of a common cause. I would here touch upon a few incidents, little though they are, showing how nature is working in its own quiet way.

Dr. Birdwood has brought to the notice of the English public certain songs, now being spread among the people of Western India, against the destruction of Indian industry and arts. We may laugh at this as a futile attempt to shut out English machine-made cheaper goods against hand-made dearer ones. But little do we think what this movement is likely to grow into, and what new phases it may take in time. The songs are at present directed against English wares, but they are also a natural and effective preparation against other English things when the time comes, if the English in their blindness allow such times to come. The songs are full of loyalty, and I have not the remotest doubt in the sincerity of that loyalty. But if the present downward course of India continue, if the mass of the people at last begin to despair of any amelioration, and if educated youths, without the wisdom and experience of the world, become their leaders, it will be but a *very, very* short step from loyalty to disloyalty, to turn the course of indignation from English wares to English rule. The songs will remain the same; one word of curse for the rule will supply the spark.

Here is another little incident with its own significance. The London Indian Society, a political body of many of the native residents of London, had a dinner the other day, and they invited guests. The three guests were, one Hindu, one Mahomedan, and one Parsee. The society itself is a body representing nearly all the principal classes of India. It is small, and may be laughed at as uninfluential, and can do nothing. But it shows how a sympathy of political common cause is bringing the different classes together, and how, in time, such small seeds may grow into large trees. Every member of this little body is carrying back with him ideas which, as seeds, may produce crops, sweet or bitter according to the cultivation they may receive at our rulers' hands.

I turn to one bright incident on the other side. True to their English nature and character, there are some Englishmen who try to turn the current of Native thought towards an appreciation of English intentions, and to direct English thought towards a better understanding of England's duty to India. The East India Association is doing this

beneficent work, more especially by the fair and English character of its course of bringing about free and full discussion upon every topic and from every point of view, so that, by a sifting of the full expression of different views, truth may be elicited. Though yet little appreciated by the English public, the English members of this Association are fulfilling the duty of patriotism to their own country and of benefaction towards India. How far their good efforts will succeed is yet to be seen. But they at least do one thing. These Englishmen, as well as public writers like Fawcett, Hyndman, Perry, Caird, Knight, Bell, Wilson, Wood, and others, vindicate to India the English character, and show that when Englishmen as a body will *understand* their duty and responsibility, the Natives of India may fairly expect a conduct of which theirs is a sample—a desire indeed, to act rightly by India. The example and earnestness of these Englishmen, though yet small their number, keep India's hope alive—that England will produce a statesman who will have the moral courage and firmness to face the Indian problem, and do what the world should expect from England's conscience, and from England's mission to humanity.

I have thus touched upon a few incidents only to illustrate the various influences that are at work. Whether the result of all these forces and influences will be good or bad, remains, as I have said, in the hands of the Secretary of State for India.

In my last paper I said the thinking Natives were as yet staunch in their loyalty to the British rule, as they were yet fully hopeful of the future from the general character and history of the English people. They believe that when the conscience of the English nation is awakened, it will not be long before India receives full and thorough redress for all she has been suffering. While thus hopeful of the future, it is desirable that our rulers should know and consider what, as to the past, is passing in many a thinking Native mind.

They are as grateful as any people can be for whatever real good of peace and order and education has been done for them; but they also ask what good, upon the whole, England has done to India. It is sadly poor, and increasing in poverty, both material and moral. They consider and bewail the unnatural treatment India has been receiving.

They dwell upon the strange contrast between the words and deeds of the English rulers; how often deliberate and solemn promises are made and broken. I need not here instance again what I have at some length shown in my papers on the Poverty of India* under the heading of "Non-Fulfilment of Solemn Promises."†

* *Journal of the East India Association*, Vol. IX., pages 375 to 405.

† The Duke of Argyll, as Secretary of State for India, said in his speech of

I would refer here to one or two characteristic instances only. The conception for an Engineering College in London was no sooner formed than it became an accomplished fact; and Mr. Grant Duff, then Under-Secretary of State, in his place in Parliament, proclaimed what great boons "we" were conferring on the English people, but quite oblivious at whose sacrifices. It was an English interest, and the thing was done as quick as it was thought of. On the other hand, a clause for Native interests, proposed in 1867, took three years to pass, and in such a form as to be simply ineffectual. I asked Sir Stafford Northcote, at the time of the proposal, to make it some way imperative, but without effect. Again, after being passed after three years, it remained a dead letter for seven years more, and might have remained so till Doomsday for aught any of the Indian authorities cared. But, thanks to the persevering exertions of one of England's true sons, Sir Erskine Perry, some steps were at last taken to frame the rules that were required, and it is now, in the midst of a great deal of fine writing, making some, though very slow, progress. For such, even as it is, we are thankful; but greater efforts are necessary to stem the torrent of the drain. Turning to the Uncovenanted Service, Sir Stafford Northcote's despatch of 8th February, 1868, declared that Europeans should not be allowed in this service to override "the inherent rights of the Natives of the country." Now, in what spirit was this despatch treated till very lately? Was it not simply, or is it not even now, almost a dead letter?

In the matter of the load of the public debt of India, it is mainly due to the wars of the English conquests in India, and English wars abroad in the name of India. Not a farthing has been spent by England for its British Indian Empire. The burden of all England's wars in Asia has been thrown on India's shoulders. In the Abyssinian War, India narrowly and lightly escaped; and in the present Afghan War, her escape from whatever portion she may be saved is not less narrow. Though such the character of nearly the whole of the public debt (excluding for public works), being caused by the actions by which England has become the mistress of a great Empire, and thereby the first nation in the world, she would not move her little finger to give India any such help as is within her power, without even any material sacrifice to herself—viz., that of guaranteeing this public debt, so that India may derive some little relief from reduced interest.

When English interests are concerned, their accomplishment is often a foregone conclusion. But India's interests always require long and 11th March, 1869, with regard to the employment of Natives in the Covenanted Service: "I must say that we have not fulfilled our duty, or the promises and engagements which we have made."

anxious thought—thought that seldom begins, and when it does begin, seldom ends in any thorough good result. It is useless to conceal that the old pure and simple faith in the honour and word of the English rulers is much shaken, and were it not for the faith in the conscience of the statesmen and people in *this* country, any hope of good by an alteration of the present British Indian policy would be given up.

The English rulers boast, and justly so, that they have introduced education and Western civilization into India; but, on the other hand, they act as if no such thing had taken place, and as if all this boast was pure moonshine. Either they have educated, or have not. If they deserve the boast, it is a strange self-condemnation that after half a century or more of such efforts, they have not yet prepared a sufficient number of men fit for the service of their own country. Take even the Educational Department itself. We are made B.A.s and M.A.s and M.D.s, &c., with the strange result that we are not yet considered fit to teach our countrymen. We must have yet forced upon us even in this department, as in every other, every European that can be squeezed in. To keep up the sympathy and connection with the current of European thought, an English head may be appropriately and beneficially retained in a few of the most important institutions; but as matters are at present, all boast of education is exhibited as so much sham and delusion.

In the case of former foreign conquests, the invaders either retired with their plunder and booty, or became the rulers of the country. When they only plundered and went back, they made, no doubt, great wounds; but India, with her industry, revived and healed the wounds. When the invaders became the rulers of the country, they settled down *in* it, and whatever was the condition of their rule, according to the character of the sovereign of the day, there was at least no material or moral drain in the country.* Whatever the country produced remained in the country; whatever wisdom and experience was acquired in her services remained among her own people. With the

* Sir Stafford Northcote, in his speech in Parliament on 24th May, 1867, said: "Nothing could be more wonderful than our Empire in India, but we ought to consider on what conditions we held it, and how our predecessors held it. The greatness of the Mogul Empire depended upon the liberal policy that was pursued by men like Akbar availing themselves of Hindu talent and assistance, and identifying themselves as far as possible with the people of the country. He thought that they ought to take a lesson from such a circumstance, and if they were to do their duty towards India, they could only discharge that duty by obtaining the assistance and counsel of all who were great and good in that country. It would be absurd in them to say that there was not a large fund of statesmanship and ability in the Indian character."—*Times*, of 25th May, 1867.

English the case is peculiar. There are the great wounds of the first wars in the burden of the public debt, and those wounds are kept perpetually open and widening, by draining away the life-blood in a continuous stream. The former rulers were like butchers hacking here and there, but the English with their scientific scalpel cut to the very heart, and yet, lo ! there is no wound to be seen, and soon the plaster of the high talk of civilization, progress, and what not, covers up the wound ! The English rulers stand sentinel at the front door of India, challenging the whole world, that they do and shall protect India against all comers, and themselves carry away by a back-door the very treasures they stand sentinel to protect.

In short, had England deliberately intended to devise the best means of taking away India's wealth in a quiet continuous drain, without scandalising the world, she could not have hit upon a more effectual plan than the present lines of policy. A Viceroy tells us, the people of India enjoy but scanty subsistence ; and this is the outcome of the British rule.

No doubt, the exertions of individual Europeans at the time of famines may be worthy of admiration ; the efforts of Government and the aid of the contributions of the British people to save life, deserve every gratitude. But how strange it is that the British rulers do not see that, after all, they themselves are the main cause of the destruction that ensues from droughts ; that it is the drain of India's wealth by *them* that lays at their own door the dreadful results of misery, starvation, and deaths of millions ! England does not know famines, be the harvest however bad or scanty. She has the means of buying her food from the whole world. India is being unceasingly deprived of these means, and when famine comes, the starving have to be taxed so much more to save the dying.

England's conduct in India is in strange contrast with her conduct with almost any other country. Owing to the false groove in which she is moving, she does violence to her own best instincts. She sympathises with and helps every nationality that struggles for a constitutional representative government. On the one hand, she is the parent of, and maintains, the highest constitutionalism ; and, on the other, she exercises a clear and, though thoughtlessly, a despoiling despotism in India, under a pseudo-constitutionalism, in the shape of the farce of the present Legislative Councils.

Of all countries in the world, if any one has the greatest claim on England's consideration, to receive the boons of a constitutional representative government at her hands, and to have her people governed as England governs her own, that country is India, her most sacred trust

and charge. But England, though she does everything she can for other countries, fights shy of, and makes some excuse or other to avoid, giving to the people of India their fair share in the legislation of their country. Now I do not mean to say that India can suddenly have a full-blown Parliament, and of such wide-spread representation as England enjoys. But has England made any honest efforts to gradually introduce a true representation of the people, excepting some solitary exceptions of partial municipal representation? I need not dwell upon the present farce of the nomination system for the Legislative Councils, and of the dummies that are sometimes nominated. I submit that a small beginning can be well made now. I would take the Bombay Presidency as an instance. Suppose the present Legislative Council is extended to twenty-one members, thirteen of these to be nominated from officials and non-officials by the Government, and eight to be elected by the principal towns of the Presidency. This will give Government a clear majority of five, and the representative element, the minority, cannot do any harm, or hamper Government; in England the majority determines the Government. In India this cannot be the case at present, and so the majority must follow the Government. It would be, when something is extremely outrageous, that the minority would, by force of argument and truth, draw towards it the Government majority; and even in any such rare instance, all that will happen will be that Government will be prevented from doing any such outrageous things. In short, in such an arrangement, Government will remain all-powerful, as it must for a long time to come; while there will be also independent persons, actually representing the people, to speak the sentiments of the people; thereby giving Government the most important help, and relieving them from much responsibility, anxiety, and mistakes. The representative element in the minority will be gradually trained in constitutional government. They will have no inducement to run wild with prospects of power; they will have to maintain the reason of their existence, and will, therefore, be actuated by caution and good sense. They can do no harm, but a vast amount of good, both to the Government and the governed. The people will have the satisfaction that their rulers were doing their duty, and endeavouring to raise them to their own civilization.

There are in the Bombay Presidency the following towns of more than 50,000 population. Bombay having by far the largest, and with its importance as the capital of the Presidency, may be properly allowed three representatives.

The towns are—

*Bombay.	Poona.	Ahmedabad.	Surat.	Kurrachi.	Sholapore.
644,405 ...	118,886 ...	116,873 ...	107,149 ...	53,526 ...	53,403

Thus, Bombay having three, the Gujerati division of the Presidency will be represented by Ahmedabad and Surat, the Maratha portion by Poona and Sholapore, and Sind by Kurrachi, making altogether eight members, which will be a fair, though a small, representation to begin with. Government may with advantage adopt a larger number; all I desire and insist is, that there must be a fair *representative* element in the Councils. As to the qualifications of electors and candidates for election, Government is quite competent to fix upon some, as they did in the case of the Bombay Corporation, and such qualifications may from time to time be modified as experience may suggest. With this modification in the present Legislative Council, a great step will have been taken towards one of the greatest boons which India asks and expects at England's hands. Without some such element of the people's voice in all the Legislative Councils, it is impossible for Englishmen, more and more estranged and isolated as they are becoming, to be able to legislate for India in the true spirit and feeling of her wants.

After having a glorious history of heroic struggles for constitutional government, England is now rearing up a body of Englishmen in India, trained up and accustomed to despotism, with all the feelings of impatience, pride, and high-handedness of the despot becoming gradually ingrained in them, and with the additional training of the dissimulation of constitutionalism. Is it possible that such habits and training of despotism, with which Indian officials return from India, should not, in the course of time, influence the English character and institutions? The English in India, instead of raising India, are hitherto themselves descending and degenerating to the lower level of Asiatic despotism. Is this a Nemesis that will in fulness of time show to them what fruit their conduct in India produced? It is extraordinary how nature may revenge itself for the present unnatural course of England in India, if England, not yet much tainted by this demoralization, does not, in good time, check this new leaven that is gradually fermenting among her people.

There is the opium trade. What a spectacle it is to the world! In England no statesman dares to propose that opium may be allowed to be sold in public-houses at the corners of every street, in the same way as beer or spirits. On the contrary, Parliament, as representing the whole nation, distinctly enacts that "opium and all preparations of opium

* "Statistical Abstract of British India, 1879," page 21.

"or of poppies," as "poison," be sold by certified chemists only, and "every box, bottle, vessel, wrapper, or cover in which such poison is contained, be distinctly labelled with the name of the article and the word 'poison,' and with the name and address of the seller of the poison." And yet, at the other end of the world, this Christian, highly civilized, and humane England forces a "heathen" and "barbarous" Power to take this "poison," and tempts a vast human race to use it, and to degenerate and demoralize themselves with this "poison"! And why? Because India cannot fill up the remorseless drain; so China must be dragged in to make it up, even though it be by being "poisoned." It is wonderful how England reconciles this to her conscience. This opium trade is a sin on England's head, and a curse on India for her share in being the instrument. This may sound strange as coming from any Natives of India, as it is generally represented as if India it was that benefited by the opium trade. The fact simply is that, as Mr. Duff said, India is nearly ground down to dust, and the opium trade of China fills up England's drain. India derives not a particle of benefit. All India's profits of trade, and several millions from her very produce (scanty as it is, and becoming more and more so), and with these all the profit of opium, go the same way of the drain—to England. Only India shares the curse of the Chinese race. Had this cursed opium trade not existed, India's miseries would have much sooner come to the surface, and relief and redress would have come to her long ago; but this trade has prolonged the agonies of India.

In association with this trade is the stigma of the Salt-tax upon the British name. What a humiliating confession to say that, after the length of the British rule, the people are in such a wretched plight that they have nothing that Government can tax, and that Government must, therefore, tax an absolute necessary of life to an inordinate extent! The slight flash of prosperity during the American War showed how the people of India would enjoy and spend when they have anything to enjoy and spend; and now, can anything be a greater condemnation of the results of British lines of policy than that the people have nothing to spend and enjoy, and pay tax on, but that they must be pinched and starved in a necessary of life?

The English are, and justly and gloriously, the greatest champions of liberty of speech. What a falling off must have taken place in their character, when, after granting this boon to India, they should have even thought of withdrawing it! This act, together with that of disarming the people, is a clear confession by the rulers to the world that they have no hold as yet upon the affection and loyalty of the people, though in the same breath they make every profession of their

belief in the loyalty of the people. Now, which is the truth? And are gagging and disarming the outcome of a long benign rule?

Why do the English allow themselves to be so perpetually scared by the fears of Russian or any other foreign invasion? If the people of India be satisfied, if their hearts and hands be with England, she may defy a dozen Russias. On the other hand, do British statesmen think that, however sharp and pointed their bayonets, and however long-flying their bullets, they may not find the two hundred millions of the people of India her political Himalaya to be pierced through, when the present political union among the different peoples is more strengthened and consolidated?

There is the stock argument of over-population. They talk, and so far truly, of the increase by British peace, but they quite forget the destruction by the British drain. They talk of the pitiless operations of economic laws, but somehow they forget that there is no such thing in India as the natural operation of economic laws. It is not the pitiless operations of economic laws, but it is the thoughtless and pitiless action of the British policy; it is the pitiless eating of India's substance in India, and the further pitiless drain to England; in short, it is the pitiless *perversion* of economic laws by the sad bleeding to which India is subjected that is destroying India. Why blame poor Nature, when the fault lies at your own door? Let natural and economic laws have their full and fair play, and India will become another England, with manifold greater benefit to England herself than at present.

As long as the English do not allow the country to produce what it can produce, as long as the people are not allowed to enjoy what they can produce, as long as the English are the very party on their trial, they have no right, and are not competent, to give an opinion whether the country is over-populated or not. In fact, it is absurd to talk of over-population—*i.e.*, the country's incapability, by its food or other produce, to supply the means of support to its people—if the country is unceasingly and forcibly deprived of its means or capital. Let the country keep what it produces, for only then can any right judgment be formed whether it is over-populated or not. Let England first hold hands off India's wealth, and then there will be disinterestedness in, and respect for, her judgment. The present cant of the excuse of over-population is adding a distressful insult to agonizing injury. To talk of over-population at present is just as reasonable as to cut off a man's hands, and then to taunt him that he was not able to maintain himself or move his hands.

When persons talk of the operation of economic laws, they forget the very first and fundamental principles. Says Mr. Mill: "Industry is limited by capital." "To employ industry on the land is to apply

“capital to the land.” “Industry cannot be employed to any greater extent than there is capital to invest.” “There can be no more industry than is supplied by materials to work up, and food to eat; yet, in regard to a fact so evident, it was long continued to be believed that laws and governments, without creating capital, could create industry.” And while Englishmen are sweeping away this very capital, they raise up their hands and wonder why India cannot have industry.

The English are themselves the head and front of the offending, and yet they talk of over-population, and every mortal irrelevant thing but the right cause—viz., their own drain of the material and moral wealth of the country.

The present form of relations between the paramount Power and the Princes of India is un-English and iniquitous. Fancy a people, the greatest champions of fair-play and justice, having a system of political agency by which, as the Princes say, they are stabbed in the dark; the Political Agents making secret reports, and the Government often acting thereon, without a fair inquiry or explanation from the Princes. The Princes, therefore, are always in a state of alarm as to what may befall them unawares. If the British authorities deliberately wished to adopt a method by which the Princes should always remain alarmed and irritated, they could not have hit upon a more effective one than what exists. If these Princes can feel assured that their treaty rights will be always honourably and faithfully observed, that there will be no constant nibbling at their powers, that it is not the ulterior policy of the British to pull them down gradually to the position of mere nobles of the country, as the Princes at present suspect and fear, and if a more just and fair mode of political agency be adopted, I have not the least hesitation in saying that, as much from self-interest alone as from any other motive, these Princes will prove the greatest bulwark and help to perpetuate British supremacy in India. It stands to reason and common sense that the Native Princes clearly understand their interest, that by a power like the British only, with all the confidence it may command by its fairness as well as strength, can they be saved from each other and even from themselves. Relieved of any fear from the paramount Power, they will the more readily listen to counsels of reform which they much need. The English can then exercise their salutary influence in advising and helping them to root out the old corrupt régimes, and in making them and their courtiers to understand that power was not self-aggrandizement, but responsibility for the good of the people. I say, from personal conversation with some of the Princes, that they thoroughly understand their interest under the protection of the present paramount Power.

It is useless for the British to compare themselves with the past Native rulers. If the British do not show themselves to be vastly superior in proportion to their superior enlightenment and civilization, if India does not prosper and progress under them far more largely, there will be no justification for their existence in India. The thoughtless past drain we may consider as our misfortune, but a similar future will, in plain English, be deliberate plunder and destruction.

I do not repeat here several other views which I have already expressed in my last memorandum.

I have thus given a general sketch of what is passing in many Natives' minds on several subjects. It is useless and absurd to remind us constantly that once the British fiat brought order out of chaos, and to make that an everlasting excuse for subsequent shortcomings and the material and moral impoverishment of the country. The Natives of the present day have not seen that chaos, and do not feel it; and though they understand it, and very thankful they are for the order brought, they see the present drain, distress, and destruction, and they feel it and bewail it.

By all means, let Englishmen be proud of the past. We accord them every credit for the order and law they brought about, and are deeply thankful to them; but let them now face the present, let them clearly realize, and manfully acknowledge, the many shortcomings of omission and commission by which, with the best of intentions, they have reduced India to material and moral wretchedness; and let them, in a way worthy of their name and history, repair the injury they have inflicted. It is fully in their power to make their rule a blessing to India, and a benefit and glory to England, by allowing India her own administration, under their superior controlling and guiding hand; or, in their own oft-repeated professions and words, "by governing India for India's good."

May the God of all nations lead the English to a right sense of their duty to India! is my humble and earnest prayer.

DADABHAI NAOROJI.

32, Great St. Helens, London,

4th January, 1881.

SIR LOUIS MALLET, *the Under-Secretary of State for India, India Office, London, S.W.*

SIR,—I beg to request you to submit the accompanying memorandum, No. 3, on some of the statements in the "Report of the Indian Famine

"Commission, 1880," to his Lordship the Secretary of State for India, and I hope his Lordship will give his kind and generous consideration to it.

I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

DADABHAI NAOROJI.

No. 3.

MEMORANDUM ON A FEW STATEMENTS IN THE
REPORT OF THE INDIAN FAMINE COMMISSION,
1880.

Part II., Chapter I., Section 7, treats of Incidence of Taxation. I submit that the section is fallacious, gives an erroneous notion of the true state of the matter, and is misleading. We shall see what the reality is.

The income of a country consists of two parts :

1. The internal total annual material production of the country (agricultural, manufactures, mines, and fisheries).
2. The external annual profits of foreign trade.

There is no other source of income beyond these two, excepting, in the case of British India, the tributes and contributions of Native States, of about 700,000*l*.

The incidence of taxation of any country means that a certain amount or portion is taken out of this income for purposes of government. Call this portion revenue, tax, rent, service, contributions, blessing, curse, or by any name from A to Z in the English vocabulary; the fact simply is, that the country has to give a certain proportion out of its income for purposes of government. Every farthing that the country has thus to contribute for government has to be produced or earned from foreign trade, or, in other words, has to be given from the annual income. No portion of it is rained down from heaven, or produced by some magic by the government of the country. The 24,000,000*l*. which the Commissioners call "other than taxation" do not come down from the heavens, nor are to be obtained from any other source than the annual income of the country, just the same as what they call taxation proper. And so also, what the Commissioners call "rent," with regard to the revenue derived from land.

Whatever plans, wise or unwise, a Government adopt of distributing the incidence of the revenue among different classes of people; from whatever and how many soever different sources Government may

obtain its revenue; by whatever hundred-and-one names may these different items of revenue be called,—the sum total of the whole matter is, that out of the annual income of the country a certain portion is raised for the purposes of government, and the real incidence of this revenue in any country is the proportion it bears to the actual annual income of the country, call the different modes of raising this revenue what you like.

Now England raises at present for purposes of government about 83,000,000*l.* The income of the United Kingdom is well-nigh 1,000,000,000*l.** a-year. The proportion, therefore, of the revenue of 83,000,000*l.*, or even 84,000,000*l.*, is about 8½ per cent. out of the annual income.

Now India's income, as I have first roughly shown in 1870, in my paper on the "Wants and Means of India,"† and subsequently in my paper on the "Poverty of India,"‡ is hardly 300,000,000*l.* per annum. This statement has not been refuted by anybody. On the contrary, Mr. Grant Duff, though cautiously, admitted in his speech in 1871, in these words: "The income of British India has been guessed at "300,000,000*l.* per annum." And Lord Mayo quoted Mr. Grant Duff's speech soon after, without any contradiction, but rather with approval. If the fact be otherwise, let Government give the correct fact every year. Out of this income of 300,000,000*l.*, the revenue raised in India for purposes of government is 65,000,000*l.*, or very near 22 per cent.

Thus, then, the actual heaviness of the weight of revenue on India is quite two and a-half times as much as that on England. This is the simple fact, that out of the grand income of 1,000,000,000*l.* of only 34,000,000 of population, England raises for the purposes of government only 8½ per cent.; while out of the poor wretched income of 300,000,000*l.* of a population of nearly 200,000,000, two and a-half times more, or nearly 22 per cent., are raised in India for the same purpose: and yet people coolly and cruelly write that India is lightly taxed. It must be further realized what this disproportionate pressure upon a most prosperous and wealthy community like that of England, and the most wretched and poverty and famine-stricken people of India, means. To the one it is not a flea-bite, to the other it is starvation

* The "Westminster Review" of January, 1876, gives the national production for 1875 of the United Kingdom as 28*l.* per head of population. I do not know whether profits of trade are included in this amount. Mr. Grant Duff, in 1871, took 800,000,000*l.*, or, roundly, 30*l.* per head of population. The population is above 34,000,000, which, at 28*l.*, gives 952,000,000*l.*

† "Journal of the East India Association," Vol. IX., page 283.

‡ "Journal of the East India Association," Vols. IX. and X.

and death of millions, under her present unnatural treatment. For this is not all; a far deeper and worse depth lies behind.

Let me, then, once more repeat, that out of the grand income of 1,000,000,000*l.* a-year, England gives only 8½ per cent. for Government purposes, while out of the wretched poverty of India, of an income of 800,000,000*l.*, she gives 22 per cent. for purposes of government. Now comes the worst evil of the whole; to which English writers, with few exceptions, always shut their eyes.

Of the 88,000,000*l.* of revenue which is raised in England, every farthing returns, in some shape or other, to the people themselves. In fact, England pays with one hand and receives back with the other. And such is the case in every country on the face of the earth, and so it must be; but poor India is doomed otherwise. Out of the 65,000,000*l.* taken from her wretched income, some 80,000,000*l.* or 40,000,000*l.* are never returned to the people, but are eaten up in the country, and taken away out of the country, by those who are not the people of the country—by England, in short. I pass over this mournful topic here, as I have to refer to it again further on.

I may be taken to task that I am making a very indefinite statement when I talk of "some 80,000,000*l.* or 40,000,000*l.*" as being eaten up and taken away by England. The fault is not mine, but that of Government. In 1873, Sir David Wedderburn moved for a return for the number, salaries, &c., of all the Services. The return was ordered in July, 1873. It is now over seven years, but has not been made. Again, in 1879, Mr. Bright moved for returns (salaries, &c., 19th June, 1879), and Sir David Wedderburn moved for returns (East India Services, 20th and 23rd June, 1879, and East India Services, 24th June, 1879). These returns have not yet been made. I hope they are being prepared. When these returns are made, we shall know definitely and clearly what the amount is that, out of the revenue of 65,000,000*l.*, does not at all return to the people of India, but is eaten up in, and carried away from, India every year by England. Such returns ought to be made every year. Once it is made, the work of succeeding years will be only the alterations or revision for the year; or revised estimates every two or three years even will do. To Government itself a return like this will be particularly useful. They will then act with clear light, instead of groping in darkness as at present, and, though actuated with the best of intentions, still inflicting upon India untold misfortunes and miseries. And it will then see how India, of all other countries in the world, is subjected to a most unnatural and destructive treatment.

The next sections, viii. and ix., on trade and railways, are pervaded with the same fallacies as those of Mr. Danvers' Memo. of 28th June, 1880, and to which I replied in my letter of 13th September, 1880. I therefore do not go over the same ground here again. I need only refer to one statement, the last sentence of paragraph 4 of section viii.:—

“As to the other half of the excess which is due to the cost of English administration, there can hardly be room for doubt that it is to the advantage of India to pay the sum really necessary to secure its peaceful government, without which no progress would be possible; and so long as this condition is not violated, it does not seem material whether a part of the charge has to be met in England or not.”

A statement more wrong in its premises and conclusion can hardly be met with. Let us see.

By “the other half of the excess” is meant 8,000,000*l.*

The Commissioners tell the public that India pays 8,000,000*l.* for securing peaceful government. This is the fiction; what are the facts?

England, of *all* nations on the face of the earth, enjoys the utmost security of life and property of every kind, from a strong and peaceful government. For this England “pays” 83,000,000*l.* a-year.

In the same manner India “pays” not 8,000,000*l.*, but 65,000,000*l.* for the same purpose, and should be able and willing to “pay” twice or thrice 65,000,000*l.*, under natural circumstances, similar to those of England.

Thus England “pays” 83,000,000*l.*, and India “pays” 65,000,000*l.* for purposes of peaceful government. But here the parallel ends, and English writers, with very few exceptions, fight shy of going beyond this point, and misstate the matter as is done in the above extract. Let us see what is beyond.

Of the 83,000,000*l.* which England “pays” for security of life and property, or peaceful government, every farthing returns to the people themselves. It is not even a flea-bite or any bite to the people of England that they “pay” 83,000,000*l.* for peaceful government. They simply give with one hand and receive back with the other. The country and the people enjoy the *full benefit* of every farthing they either produce in the country or earn with foreign trade.

But with India the *fact* is quite otherwise. Out of the 65,000,000*l.* which she “pays,” like England, for peaceful government, 30,000,000*l.* or 40,000,000*l.* do *not* return to the people of the country. These 30,000,000*l.* or 40,000,000*l.* are eaten up in the country and carried away from the country by a foreign people. The people of India are

thus deprived of this enormous amount year after year, and are, as a natural consequence, weakened more and more every year in their capacity for production; or, in plain words, India is being simply destroyed.

The *romance* is that there is security of life and property in India; the reality is that there is no such thing.

There is security of life and property in one sense or way—*i.e.*, the people are secure from any violence from each other or from Native despots. So far there is real security of life and property, and for which India never denies her gratitude. But from England's own grasp there is no security of property at all, and, as a consequence, no security for life. India's property is not secure. What is secure, and well secure, is that England is perfectly safe and secure, and does so with perfect security, to carry away from India, and to eat up in India, her property at the present rate of some 30,000,000*l.* or 40,000,000*l.* a-year.

The reality, therefore, is that the policy of English rule, as it is (not as it can and should be), is an everlasting, unceasing, and every day increasing foreign invasion, utterly, though gradually, destroying the country. I venture to submit that every right-minded Englishman, calmly and seriously considering the problem of the present condition and treatment of India by England, will come to this conclusion.

The old invaders came with the avowed purpose of plundering the wealth of the country. They plundered and went away, or conquered and became the Natives of the country. But the great misfortune of India is that England did *not* mean, or wish, or come with the intention of plundering, and yet events have taken a course which has made England the worst foreign invader she has had the misfortune to have. India does not get a moment to breathe or revive. "More Europeans," "More Europeans," is the eternal cry; and this very Report itself of the Commission is not free from it.

The present position of England in India has, moreover, produced another most deplorable evil from which the worst of old foreign invasions was free: that with the deprivation of the vital material blood of the country, to the extent of 30,000,000*l.* or 40,000,000*l.* a-year, the whole higher "wisdom" of the country is also carried away.

I therefore venture to submit that India *does not* enjoy security of her property and life, and also, moreover, of "knowledge" or "wisdom." To millions in India life is simply "half feeding," or starvation, or famines and disease.

View the Indian problem from any point you like, you come back

again and again to this central fact, that England takes from India every year 30,000,000*l.* or 40,000,000*l.* worth of her property, with all the lamentable consequences from such a loss, and with a continuous diminution of the capacity of India for production, together with the moral loss of all higher wisdom.

India would be quite able and willing to "pay," as every other country or as England "pays," for peaceful government; but no country on the face of the earth can stand the deprivation of property that India is subjected to without being crushed to death.

Suppose England were subjected to such a condition at the hand of some foreign Power; would she not, to a man, clamour, that far better would they fly at each other's throat, have strifes in streets of civil wars, or fights in fields for foreign wars, with all the chances of fame or fortune on survival, than submit to the inglorious, miserable deaths from poverty and famines, with wretchedness and disease in case of survival? I have no hesitation in appealing to any Englishman to say which of the two deaths he would prefer, and I shall not have to wait long for the reply.

What is property worth to India, which she can only call her own in name, but not in reality, and which her own children cannot enjoy? What is life worth to her, that must perish by millions at the very touch of drought or distress, or can have only a half-starving existence?

The confusion and fallacy in the extract I have given above, therefore, consists in this. It is not that India pays for peaceful government some 8,000,000*l.*; she pays for it 65,000,000*l.*, just as England pays 84,000,000*l.* But there is one feature peculiar to India—she needs British wise and beneficent guidance and supervision. British aid of this kind can, under any circumstances, be but from outside the Indian family—*i.e.*, foreign. This aid must be reasonably paid for by India. Now, if the whole foreign agency of European men and materials required under the direct and indirect control of Government, both in India and England, in every shape or form, be clearly laid down, to be confined within the limit of a fixed "foreign list" of, say, 5,000,000*l.*, or even say 8,000,000*l.*, though very much, which the Commissioners ask India to pay, India could very probably pay without being so destroyed as at present. But the present thoughtless and merciless exhaustion of some 30,000,000*l.* or, 40,000,000*l.*, or, maybe even much more, is crushing, cruel, and destructive.

In fact, leaving the past alone as a misfortune, the continuance of the present drain will be, in plain English, nothing less than plunder of an unceasing foreign invasion, and not a reasonable price for a

beneficent rule, as the Commissioners wrongly and thoughtlessly endeavour to persuade the public.

The great misfortune of India is, that the temptation or tendency towards selfishness and self-aggrandizement of their own countrymen is too great and blinding for Englishmen (with few exceptions) connected with India to see that power is a sacred trust and responsibility for the good of the people. We have this profession to any amount, but unless and till the conscience of England, and of English honest thinkers and statesmen, is awakened, the performance will remain poor, or *nil*, as at present.

Lord Ripon said, "India needs rest." Truer words could not be spoken. Yes, she needs rest; rest from the present unceasing and ever-increasing foreign invasion, from whose unceasing blows she has not a moment allowed to breathe.

I said before that even this Famine Report was not free from the same clamour, "More Europeans, more Europeans!"

Whenever any question of reform arises, the only remedy that suggests itself to English officials' minds is, "Apply more European leeches, apply more European leeches!"

The Commission suggests the institution of an Agricultural Department, and a very important suggestion it is. But they soon forget that it is *for India* this is required, that it is at India's expense it has to be done, that it is from India's wretched income that this expenditure has to be provided, and that India cannot afford to have more blood sucked out of her for more Europeans, while depriving so much her own children; in short, that Native agency, under a good English head or two, would be the most natural and proper agency for the purpose. No; prostrate as India is, and for which very reason the Commission was appointed to suggest a remedy, they can only say, "More Europeans," as if no such thing as a people existed in India.

Were any Englishman to make such a proposal for England, that French or German youths be instructed at England's expense, and that such youths make up the different public departments, he would be at once scouted and laughed at. And yet these Commissioners thoughtlessly and seriously suggest and recommend to aggravate the very evil for which they were expected to suggest a remedy.

I appeal most earnestly to his Lordship the Secretary of State for India, that, though the department suggested by the Commissioners is very important, his Lordship will not adopt the mode which the Commissioners have suggested with good intentions, but with thoughtlessness about the rights and needs of India; that, with the exception

of some thoroughly qualified necessary Europeans at the head, the whole agency ought to be Native, on the lines described by the Commissioners. There can be no lack of Natives of the kind required, or it would be a very poor compliment indeed to the educational exertions of the English rulers during the past half-century.

A new danger is now threatening India. Hitherto India's wealth *above* the surface of the land has been draining away to England; now the wealth *under* the surface of the land will also be taken away, and India lies prostrate and unable to help herself. England has taken away her capital. That same capital will be brought to take away all such mineral wealth of the country as requires the application of large capital and expensive machinery. With the exception of the employment of the lower class of bodily and mental labourers, the larger portion of the produce will, in several shapes, be eaten up and carried away by the Europeans, first as servants, and next in profits and dividends; and poor India will have to thank her stars that she will get some crumbs, in the lower employments of her children. And great will be the sounding of trumpets of the wealth found in India, and the blessings conferred on India, just as we have sickeningly dinned into our ears, day after day, about railways, foreign trade, &c.

Now, this may sound very strange, that, knowing full well the benefits of foreign capital to any country, I should complain of its going to India. There is, under present circumstances, one great difference in the modes in which English capital goes to every other country and India. To every other country English capitalists *lend*, and there is an end of their connection with the matter. The *people* of the country use and enjoy the benefit of the capital in every way, and pay to the capitalists their interest or dividend, and, as some capitalists know to their cost, not even that. But with India the case is quite different. English capitalists do not merely lend, but with their capital they themselves invade the country. The produce of the capital is mostly eaten up by their own countrymen, and, after that, they carry away the rest in the shape of profits and dividends. The people themselves of the country *do not* derive the same benefit which is derived by every other country from English capital. The guaranteed railways not only ate up everything in this manner, but compelled India to make up the guaranteed interest also from her produce. The remedy then was adopted of making State railways. Now, under the peculiar circumstances of India's present prostration, State works would be, no doubt, the best means of securing to India the benefits of English capital.

But the misfortune is that the same canker eats into the State works also,—the same eating up of the substance by European employes. The plan by which India can be really benefited would be that all kinds of public works or mines, or all works that require capital, be undertaken by the State, with English capital and *Native* agency, with so many thoroughly competent Europeans at the head as may be absolutely necessary.

Supposing that there was even extravagance or loss, Government making up any deficiency in the interest of the loans from general revenue, will not matter much, though there is no reason why, with proper care, a Native agency cannot be formed good enough for efficient and economic working. Anyhow, in such a case the people of India will then really derive the benefit of English capital, as every other country does, with the certainty of English capitalists getting their interest from the Government, who have complete control over the revenues of India, and can, without fail, provide for the interest.

For some time, therefore, and till India, by a change in the present destructive policy of heavy European agency, has revived, and is able to help herself in a free field, it is necessary that all great undertakings which India herself is unable to carry out, for developing the resources of the country, should be undertaken by the State, but carried out chiefly by Native agency, and by preparing Natives for the purpose. Then will India recover her blood from every direction. India sorely needs the aid of English capital; but it is English *capital* that she needs, and not the English invasion to come also and eat up both capital and produce.

As things are taking their course at present with regard to the gold mines, should they prove successful, great will be the trumpeting of India's increased wealth; whilst, in reality, it will all be carried away by England.

In the United States, the people of the country enjoy all the benefits of their mines and public works with English capital, and pay to England her fair interest; and in cases of failure of the schemes, while the people have enjoyed the benefit of the capital, sometimes both capital and interest are gone. The schemes fail, and the lenders of capital may lament, but the people have enjoyed the capital and the produce as far as they went.

I have no doubt that, in laying my views plainly before the Secretary of State, my motives or sentiments towards the British rule will not be misunderstood. I believe that the result of the British rule *can be* a blessing to India, and a glory to England,—a result worthy of the foremost and most humane nation on the face of the

earth. I desire that this should take place, and I therefore lay my humble views before our rulers without shrinking. It is no pleasure to me to dwell incessantly on the wretched, heart-rending, blood-boiling condition of India; none will rejoice more than myself if my views are proved to be mistaken. The sum total of all is, that without any such intention or wish, and with every desire for the good of India, England has, in reality, been the most disastrous and destructive foreign invader of India, and, under present lines, unceasingly and every day increasingly continues to be so. This unfortunate *fact* is to be boldly faced by *England*; and I am sanguine that if once England realizes this position, she will recoil from it, and vindicate to the world her great mission of humanity and civilization among mankind. I am writing to English *gentlemen*, and I have no fear but that they will receive my sincere utterances with the generosity and love of justice of English gentlemen.

In concluding these remarks, I feel bound to say, that as far as I can judge from Mr. Caird's separate paper on the "Condition of India," he appears to have realized the abnormal economical condition of India; and I cannot but feel the true English manliness and moral courage he has displayed, that, though he went out an avowed defender of the Indian Government, he spoke out his convictions, and what he saw within his opportunities. India needs the help of such manly, conscientious, true-hearted English gentlemen to study and probe her forlorn condition, and India may then fairly hope for ample redress ere long at England's hands and conscience.

DADABHAI NAOROJI.

32, Great St. Helens, London,
January 4, 1881.

India Office, S.W., 16th February, 1881.

Sir,—I am directed by the Secretary of State for India in Council to acknowledge your letters of the 16th November and 4th January last, with accompaniments.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

T. L. SECCOMBE.

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji.

Annual Meeting, May 31, 1882.

THE Annual Meeting of the East India Association was held on May 31st, 1882, at the Chambers of the Association, 14, Bedford Row, W.C., under the chairmanship of Lord Stanley of Alderley, one of the Vice-Presidents.

After the usual preliminaries, his Lordship said it would doubtless be the pleasure of the members, since they had all had a copy of the Report and audited accounts, that they should take those documents as read. He accordingly now formally moved the adoption of the Report of the Council and the Accounts (which will be found on p. 204).

Mr. P. P. GORDON seconded this; and, in supporting it,

Mr. C. W. ARATHOON said there could, as the noble Chairman had suggested, be no necessity to occupy the time of the meeting in reading the Report, a copy of which had been sent to every member. It furnished, as they were aware, a succinct and plain account of the proceedings of the Association; and annexed to it were the accounts, duly audited by two of the members, in accordance with the Rules.

The motion for the adoption of the Report and accounts was then put and carried unanimously.

The next business being to propose that Sir Richard Temple, Bart., G.C.S.I., be elected President for the ensuing year,

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY said he had sincere pleasure in proposing this, and thought the Association might be cordially congratulated on having so distinguished a man at their head for the coming year. It was, he thought, a great advantage to have an ex-member of the Civil Service of India in such a capacity, in preference to any other Englishman who had not enjoyed the experience of Indian service. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. P. P. GORDON, in seconding this, said he believed that Sir Richard Temple was in Constantinople, and was thus prevented from being present at the meeting; and it was in these circumstances that Lord Stanley of Alderley had kindly consented to take the chair. It was quite certain they could not have a more energetic or more influential President than Sir Richard Temple. (Hear, hear.)

The resolution was then put and carried unanimously.

The next resolution, which was moved by Mr. E. J. KHORY, and seconded by Mr. P. P. GORDON, and carried unanimously, was: "That the following gentlemen be elected members of the Council: "E. B. Eastwick, Esq., C.B., Chairman; C. W. Arathoon, Esq.; "Major Evans Bell; General Sir Orfeur Cavenagh, K.C.S.I.; John "Dacosta, Esq.; Dadabhoy Byramjee, Esq.; Dadabhai Naoroji, Esq.; "M. D. Dadysett, Esq.; Robert H. Elliot, Esq.; George Foggo, Esq.; "Lieut.-Colonel P. T. French; P. Pirie Gordon, Esq.; Rev. James "Long; S. P. Low, Esq.; Colonel R. M. Macdonald; General Sir "George Malcolm, K.C.B.; O. C. Mullick, Esq.; George Palmer, Esq.; "Captain W. C. Palmer; Colonel A. B. Rathborne; Raja Rampal "Singh; Alexander Rogers, Esq.; John Shaw, Esq.; P. M. Tait, Esq.; "William Tayler, Esq.; Sir Charles J. Wingfield, K.C.S.I.; W. Martin "Wood, Esq."

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY said the next business was to move the adoption of some new Rules which had been drawn up by a Committee of the Council to whom the subject was referred. They appeared to be mainly a simplification of the old Rules of the Association. The regulations with regard to the admission of new members had, for instance, been modified with a view to quicker admission; the Council would be limited to twenty-five instead of thirty-three members; and the quorum was changed from five to three members, as a difficulty had been experienced in getting a quorum together for the transaction of the formal business of the Association. In the matter of the appointment of a Secretary there was also some alteration. The Rules, as amended, would read as follows:—

OBJECTS AND REGULATIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

Article 1. The object of the East India Association is to promote the independent and disinterested advancement, by all legitimate means, of the public interests and welfare of the Inhabitants of India generally.

Article 2. The Association shall consist of Resident and Non-Resident Ordinary and Honorary Members.

Article 3. Honorary Members shall have the same rights and privileges as Ordinary Members.

Article 4. Honorary Members shall be nominated by the Council at any Ordinary Meeting, after notice given at a previous Meeting, and shall consist of persons who have distinguished themselves in promoting the good of India.

Article 5. Ordinary Members shall be nominated and seconded by two Members of the Association, and elected at a General Meeting of the Council, if approved by a majority of two-thirds present thereat.

Article 6. The election of every Member, both Ordinary and Honorary, shall be recorded on the Minutes of the Council; and the Secretary shall forthwith notify, by letter, his election to the Member, and request such Member to furnish a standing order on his Banker for his Annual Subscription.

Article 7. Ordinary Members shall pay an Annual Subscription of £1 5s. (including *Journal* delivered free of postage) on the 1st January in every year; or may compound for the same by payment of 14l., which shall constitute a Life Member. For Members of the Branches in India, the Annual Subscription (including the *Journal*) shall be Rs. 13 Ans. 8, and the Life Subscription Rs. 150.

Article 8. The Management of the Association shall be vested in a Council, to be elected by the Members at General Meeting; such Council shall consist of a Chairman, Vice-Chairman, and not more than twenty-five Members; three to form a Quorum; eight to retire annually by rotation, but to be eligible for re-election at the Annual Meeting.

Article 9. A President of the Association shall be appointed at the Annual Meeting; and the Council may, from time to time, nominate distinguished Indian Statesmen, or others, as Vice-Presidents, subject to the confirmation of the next Annual Meeting of the Association.

Article 10. The Council shall appoint a Secretary, and such other employes as may be necessary, and fix their remuneration; but no change in such remuneration shall be made except under specific resolution of the Council, of which due notice shall have been given.

Article 11. The Council may fill up all vacancies, subject to confirmation at the next Annual Meeting of the Association.

Article 12. The Council shall meet once a month, or oftener if necessary; but the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, in their absence the Secretary, or any three Members of the Council, may at any time convene a Meeting by giving three days' notice.

Article 13. The Council may appoint Special Sub-Committees of not less than three Members of the Association, two of whom shall form a quorum.

Article 14. At the desire of five Members of the Council, or on the written requisition of ten Members of the Association, the Secretary shall convene a Special General Meeting of the Association.

Article 15. The Minutes of the proceedings of every Meeting of the Association shall be recorded in a book called the Minute Book,

and nothing which is not so recorded shall bind the Council or any Member of the Association.

Article 16. The President, or, in his absence, any Vice-President, or, in their absence, any Member nominated by the Meeting, shall preside at the Annual or Ordinary Meetings of the Association, except in special cases, in which the author of paper may, with the consent of the Council, propose a Chairman for the occasion.

Article 17. The Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the Council, or, in their absence, any Member thereof nominated by those present, shall preside at the Meetings of the Council.

Article 18. The Annual Meeting of the Association shall be held in the month of May in every year.

Article 19. An account of all receipts and disbursements of the Association shall be kept in such manner as the Council may from time to time prescribe.

Article 20. A statement of the Accounts of the Association shall be prepared, audited by one of the Members of the Council and one Member taken from the general body of the Members of the Association, and circulated with the Report of the Council to each resident Member, seven days before the Annual Meeting.

Article 21. Local Committees and Branches may be established in India, subject to the approval of the Council of the Association, and the co-operation of other Associations in India may be invited.

Article 22. The Council shall have power to make and alter any Bye-laws for the management of the Association, subject to the same being approved at the next Annual Meeting.

Article 23. No addition to or alteration in these Rules shall be made, except at the Annual Meeting of the Association, previous notice being given in the circular convening the Meeting.

Article 24. The Council may convene Meetings for the reading of papers (which have been considered and approved by them) and discussion of subjects connected with India, to be held at such time and places as may be convenient; and may publish, quarterly or otherwise, a *Journal*, containing a report of the papers and discussions, and also other matters relating to the proceedings of the Association.

Mr. JOHN SHAW said that, while he guarded himself against giving an unqualified approval of all of these Rules, as amended, he had no doubt they had been carefully considered by the Committee of the Council. In any case, he presumed that it was not competent for any member now to move any amendment of them without previous notice, and he therefore seconded the proposal for their adoption moved by the noble Chairman.

Mr. W. MARTIN WOOD said he was unable to agree with Mr. Shaw in holding that these Rules, as proposed, could not be amended except by the Council. But, putting that aside, he was sure the Council would gladly welcome any suggestions of improvement; and hence it was to be regretted that Mr. Shaw had not been more specific regarding the changes he seemed to desire. He could quite believe that the new Rules, although an improvement on the old ones, were not perfect. The old Rules had been in force from the origin of the Association, and changes were necessarily required as time elapsed; and the first attempt at revision would, perhaps, be not perfectly successful all at once; therefore, any suggestions for further improvement would be favourably considered by the Council whenever they were submitted. Moreover, as the Council were empowered to make Bye-laws, and as these have yet to be formulated, there was ample opportunity for including the ideas of any members. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. A. ARATHOON cited Article 16 of the new Rules—"The President, or, in his absence, any Vice-President, or, in their absence, any member nominated by the meeting, shall preside at the annual or ordinary meetings of the Association,"—as requiring some explanation. He had observed that it was nearly the invariable practice for gentlemen who were to read papers to bring their own Chairman; and the result was that they were favoured with the presence of distinguished men—members of Parliament and others—who, while they took the chair, did not otherwise take that vivid interest in the Association which a member of the Council would take, and the consequence sometimes was that the debates of the Association were unduly shortened, and the speakers, embarrassed by the uneasiness of the Chairman, were without that feeling of confidence so necessary to the proper expression of their ideas. He confessed himself not sufficiently familiar with the old rule to say whether the new proposal was a change, but the effect would be to put a stop to the custom to which he had alluded, as nobody but a member would be entitled to preside. While, personally, he was in favour of the change, he thought it should be distinctly stated whether this was the intention of the rule, or whether there was to be no change in the practice of the Association in the election of a Chairman.

Mr. P. P. GORDON said he did not consider it was the intention of the Committee which drew up the Rules to alter violently the custom of a lecturer or reader bringing his own Chairman, who was not unfrequently a specialist in the topic which was to be considered ;

and perhaps a provision could be made in the new Bye-laws to secure this.

Mr. A. ARATHOON said that if a regulation was specifically laid down in the Rules of the Association, it was not competent for the Council to alter or traverse it by making a bye-law. This showed that there should be a definition in Article 22 as to what were bye-laws as distinguished from constitutional rules.

Mr. JOHN SHAW said he noticed that the rule cited by Mr. Arathoon was identical with the old rule, with the exception of one word left out for the sake of grammatical correctness; and therefore it was to be presumed that there would be no alteration in the practice of the Association.

Mr. A. ARATHOON said that in that case he could only say that the rule laid down had been infringed all along.

Mr. W. MARTIN WOOD said that was doubtless true to some extent, but he differed from Mr. Arathoon in his objection to the reader of a paper bringing a Chairman to preside who might be a non-member. On the contrary, there were occasionally great advantages in the custom, and the general wish was decidedly in favour of its continuance. (Hear, hear.) This might be provided for by substituting the word "gentleman" for "member" in Article 16.

Mr. JOHN SHAW said he was still of opinion that the alterations of the Council must be accepted or refused; they could not be amended without notice. Otherwise, some member might come to the meeting with a set of rules altogether changing the constitution, and the general body of the members, being absent out of content with the proposals of the Council, would find the whole scope of the Association, perhaps, changed by a few members who put in an appearance, and who happened to fancy the proposal of the member who brought his plan in his pocket. Article 23 was sufficiently definite: "No addition to, or alteration in, these Rules shall be made, except at the Annual Meeting of the Association, previous notice being given in the circular convening the Meeting."

Mr. C. W. ARATHOON said that, with reference to Mr. Shaw's objection that the new Rules had been made by the Council, it would be well to point out that the Council had not done this useful work;

it had been given to a Committee, and the Council had not expressed an opinion regarding the new proposals. It was quite open for the meeting to accept, to modify, or to reject them.

Mr. P. P. GORDON coincided with the preceding speaker. At this, the Annual Meeting, it was competent to discuss everything relating to the management of the Association, and to consider or amend any of the proposed Rules. It was, indeed, one of the main objects of the meeting.

Mr. C. W. ARATHOON said if this General Meeting of the members could not alter or amend the Rules, then no one could do it.

Mr. A. ARATHOON said he gathered that it was the intention and desire of the Council of the East India Association to have at their head as President one who was personally interested in the government of India, and able to speak with authority regarding its details. On the other hand, it was proposed to leave undisturbed the practice of gentlemen reading papers before the Association bringing with them their own Chairman to preside on the occasion. Now, it seemed to him important that the duties of the Chairman did not intrude upon the duties of the Presidency. Supposing the President of the Association was in the Hall, was he not to take the chair?

Mr. P. P. GORDON was of opinion that the President would take the chair as a matter of course, if he was present.

Mr. A. ARATHOON: Then what would you do with the Chairman whom the lecturer has brought, and who has been duly advertised to preside?

Mr. P. P. GORDON recognized the possibility of such a contingency. The practice had grown up in consequence of the difficulty experienced in getting a President or Vice-President always to preside at ordinary meetings of the Association.

After some desultory conversation, Mr. ROGERS proposed the following addition to Article 16: "Except in special cases, in which the author of the paper may, with the consent of the Council, propose a Chairman for the occasion."

Mr. M. D. DADYSETT seconded this, and it was unanimously

adopted, together with the other Rules, as proposed by Lord Stanley of Alderley.

The ordinary business having been dispatched,

Mr. W. MARTIN WOOD took occasion to say a few words on the Report of the Council generally. He said that, while they must all feel that the Association had not done all that could be wished, it had yet done all that it could. He owned he would like to see friends in various parts of India aiding and impelling the Council in its work, and offering suggestions. Nor should such as these feel disappointed if their desires were not immediately attended to. Many members of the Council of the Association were advanced in years, worn with lengthened service in India, or much engaged in other affairs; so that the Council required to be kept up to the mark by the active members, and by representations from outside, repeated, if necessary, again and again. The objects of the Association were broad enough to include everything relating to Indian affairs, the one obvious and necessary exception being that it could not take up the grievances of claimants or the wrongs of individuals, as against the Government. For that useful and proper duty they relied upon members of both Houses of Parliament, as, for instance, the noble Lord, their President of the day, who had often done good service in that respect. (Hear, hear.) The Association, however, could fairly do more than it had yet done in drawing attention to the methods adopted in the Indian Political Department, where nearly everything is secret or hidden. It was very difficult to excite or interest people at home in a matter of this kind. The ordinary British elector supposes that the Indian authorities are all very excellent men, who give unremitting attention to their duties, and who may be fully relied upon for justice. They are unaware of, or are indifferent to, the fact that many political inquiries are conducted in secret, or in the semi-confidential way which prevents the proceedings ever appearing on public record; so that, unless some member of Parliament succeeds in obtaining publication of papers, nothing whatever is known of such cases, or of the principles upon which judgment was given; and then usually so long a period has elapsed since the event, that the interest has faded away. The East India Association might do something to improve this procedure, and to insist upon prompt and early publicity. Some notorious blunders and inconsistencies were known to have resulted from the habit of consultation *en camera*, and from the inveterate disposition to resist the reopening of any case upon which decision had once been given.

If the public were able to look on while the subjects were being discussed in official circles, and were able to make a comparison of evidence, and judge for themselves, he believed that frequently the decisions of the authorities would be very much modified, and serious mistakes would be obviated, and the public confidence materially increased. (Hear, hear.) There were many other matters which the East India Association might usefully take up; and he would take the opportunity of saying that the Council would at all times be happy to receive suggestions and assistance from their members, and especially from India. It was very much to be wished that they could increase their membership in India. (Hear, hear.) Something had been done on the Bombay side in this respect, but very little elsewhere. That state of things should not continue. Madras, Bengal, the Punjaub, should each provide the Association with members and local committees to strengthen the centre in London; because it should be remembered that the East India Association is the only organization which distinctly exerts an influence upon public administration. Other Indian Associations in London expressly abstain from politics, and avoid any semblance of interference or controversy with public officials; whereas the East India Association, upon occasion, by no means shrinks from that duty, and furnishes the Indian people with a means of obtaining representation with the English public, and with the public authorities. (Hear, hear.)

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY agreed with Mr. Martin Wood as to the usefulness of the sphere occupied by the East India Association. There were many subjects upon which it might exert influence. For instance, there were great complaints of the way in which Indian fourth-class passengers on the railways were treated, and remonstrances have been disregarded. The East India Association might very well try to influence a reform in such matters.

The Rev. JAMES LONG moved a vote of thanks to the noble Chairman for his kindness in presiding in the absence of Sir Richard Temple.

Mr. C. W. ARATHOON seconded this, saying that his Lordship had evinced his active interest in the Association and its work by contributing more than one paper, and attending the sittings on various occasions; and he was always willing to aid the Council.

The motion having been cordially adopted, Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY briefly acknowledged the compliment, and this terminated the meeting.

REPORT, 1879-81.

Your Council beg to submit their Report for the years 1879-1881. During that time the objects of the Association have been carried out, and it will be seen from the following summary that the interests of the people of India have been advocated as far as the means at the command of the Council permitted.

REMOVAL OF OFFICES.

In a previous report the Council stated that they had received a notice, under the "Public Offices Act," from the Office of Works, that their Offices at 20, Great George Street, Westminster, would be required by the Government, who had purchased the building. At Lady Day last another notice was received, that the Offices must be vacated at Michaelmas. The Council had, therefore, to look out for new Offices, and they decided on taking rooms at 14, Bedford Row, on the ground-floor; by this change a saving of £75 a-year is effected. In the rear of the house there is a large hall, which will be very convenient for meetings and lectures, and it may be hired for the purpose at a moderate charge.

The Council are glad to observe that, gradually, many of the suggestions made by the Association, and the principles advocated by it from time to time, have received the approval of the Authorities, and have been partially or wholly adopted in the conduct of Indian affairs.

In the last Report the Council informed their members that the principles advocated in their Memorial to the Secretary of State for India on the subject of "Conciliation: a Remedy for Agrarian Disorders in India," had been recognized by the Government of India: provision was made in the Bill introduced into the Legislative Council for Conciliators, so that the Civil Courts were to entertain no suit until attempts to settle the dispute privately before the Conciliator had been tried and failed.

The Council would refer to the interesting paper read by Mr. G. Foggo, on "The Employment of Native Troops in Europe,"—a suggestion that was acted on when the Prime Minister ordered Native troops to Cyprus at the time when affairs in Turkey and the East were in a dangerous state, and it was feared that war was imminent.

POPULAR REPRESENTATION IN INDIA.

A largely-attended meeting of the Association was held at the Pall Mall Restaurant, 14, Regent Street, on March 18th, 1880, under the presidency of Sir Charles J. Wingfield, C.B., K.C.S.I., when Sir David Wedderburn, Bart., M.P., read an interesting paper on "Popular Representation in India," in the course of which he said, as to the form which a scheme of representation ought to assume, he felt convinced that the Legislative Councils in India were the bodies into which an independent elective element respecting the Indian taxpayers could be most advantageously introduced. The laws under which India was actually governed were made not by the British Parliament, but by Indian Legislative Councils; and without any startling change the representative element could there be readily introduced. In the Legislative Councils there were already certain gentlemen, Native as well as European, who, being non-official, might be said to represent the general community, but who were nominated by the Government, and who were in a small minority as compared with official members of Council. In an assembly thus constituted it was clear there could not be any really independent opposition. Whether factories or forests, arbitration or irrigation, abolition of cotton duties or imposition of licence taxes, was the subject of discussion in the Indian Legislatures, it was desirable that Natives of India should be permitted to explain their own views, and to receive explanations from the Government. A discussion followed the reading of the paper, a report of which will be found at full length in Vol. XIII, pages 1—21, of the *Journal* of the Association.

ENGLAND AND INDIA.

On the 3rd June, 1880, a well-attended meeting was held at the Rooms of the Association, under the presidency of Sir Arthur Hobhouse, Q.C., K.C.S.I., when Mr. Dinsha D. Davar read a paper for the purpose of considering the relation of Natives of India to the Government. Mr. Davar, while admitting that the effect of British rule had been to give increased security, prosperity, and happiness to the people, pointed out that many and grave disadvantages have also been associated with it. Natives are still debarred from having a share in the government of the country, and have not even a voice in the management of their own affairs; the Press had been gagged; taxation had been imposed upon an already over-burdened people, and so arranged that the official and professional classes, best able to pay, are exempt; a great frontier war was undertaken against the wishes of the people, and the cost had so far been imposed upon the impoverished treasury of India. While believing that the greatest misfortune that could happen to India

would be the extinction of British rule, Mr. Davar appealed for a government which would devote itself to salutary reforms, improve the condition of the ryots, and encourage Native progress socially, morally, and politically. A discussion followed the reading of the paper, which will be found reported at full length in Vol. XIII., pages 22—47, of the *Journal of the Association*.

A COURT OF APPEAL FOR INDIAN GRIEVANCES.

A meeting was held on Wednesday afternoon, June 16th, 1880, under the presidency of Stewart Erskine Rolland, Esq., when Lord Stanley of Alderley delivered an address in advocacy of the establishment of a Court of Appeal for Indian Grievances. His Lordship pointed out that it has been apparent for some years that there is a necessity for some Court to which Indian subjects can appeal against the acts of the Indian Executive, and this want has become more evident and more pressing since last year, when the Secretary of State, Lord Cranbrook, declared that he could not enter into a subject because it had not been remitted to him by the Indian Government. Formerly many cases were brought before Parliament, and before the abolition of the East India Company it was possible for them to obtain an impartial hearing; but since the separate government of India has been abolished and merged into the government of the rest of Her Majesty's dominions, no case can be brought before Parliament for redress without its appearing to be of a party character, or an attack upon the Minister. For these and other reasons, Lord Stanley of Alderley urged that a Court or Commission of Appeal should be appointed in India, to be composed of five members, some of whom shall be judges. A discussion followed the reading of the paper, which will be found recorded at full length in Vol. XIII., pages 49—74, of the *Journal of the Association*.

THE RETENTION OF CANDAHAR AND THE DEFENCE OF THE NORTH-WEST FRONTIER.

At a meeting held on Wednesday, December 15th, 1880, under the presidency of General Sir Alexander Taylor, K.C.B., Lieutenant-Colonel James Browne, R.E., C.S.I., read an interesting paper on "The Retention of Candahar and the Defence of the North-west Frontier." After comparing the merits of Candahar and Pishin for permanent occupation by England, and declaring in favour of the latter, Colonel Browne said, in face of the more urgent claims of railways to Pishin, to Peshawur, and to Thull, in the Kurum Valley, a railway along the Punjab border was not an urgent want. It would suffice for the present to construct a good

bridged road. This would prepare the way for a railroad in the future. He suggested that the whole front of the defence should be further connected by rail to the rear with Calcutta, Bombay, and Kurrachee, and linked together by a cross line from Ghazee Khan to Mooltan and Lahore. Should Russia's advance either towards Herat or towards Badakhshán require the precaution, the frontier railway and its connecting link from Dehra Ghazee to Mooltan should be completed in time to enable us to concentrate, as needed, to the north or to the south. Might it not be worth considering, he asked, whether a European military colony in Cashmere and Hazarah might not immensely strengthen our position in that quarter, while helping to solve some important social questions in India, and doing away with some of the expense and difficulties which short service and the abolition of a local European army had brought in their train? He was opposed to the retention of Candahar, and also opposed to returning to the old frontier of 1876; but, in place of Candahar, he advocated the selection of the Pishin Valley. Kurum had so many advantages that the Afghans should not be allowed to return to it. On the whole, he advocated withdrawing from Candahar in the spring, and retaining Pishin, Bori, and the Peiwar. Russia would be thrown back on the line of the Upper Indus for any fulfilment of her somewhat problematical designs upon India, and the illusions the Afghans might yet entertain as to our relative powers would be dispelled. A discussion followed the reading of the paper, which will be found reported in full in Vol. XIII., pages 75—108, of the *Journal* of the Association.

THE EXPENSES OF THE AFGHAN WAR.

A Memorial from the Bombay Branch of the Association was forwarded to the Prime Minister in March, 1881, in which an appeal was made to Mr. Gladstone to avert from the people and revenues of India the threatened imposition of any portion of the costs of the Afghan War. The Memorial urged that such imposition is unconstitutional, that it overrides the terms and drift of the Statute of 1858, which was supported by the express declaration of British statesmen of the period on both sides of the House; that the infliction of the heavy charges of this trans-frontier war on India will tend to check the industrial progress of the country, and tend to deepen the poverty of the people of India; also that the precedent threatened to be created of employing Her Majesty's Indian forces in furtherance of diplomatic or other political policy arising out of party exigencies in England or the complications of European politics, must prove disastrous, if not ruinous, to the interests of Her Majesty's Empire in India. It was next pointed out that nearly 50,000 picked troops, British and Native, maintained wholly out of

the revenues of British India, were during the Afghan War engaged in field service far beyond the frontiers of India; and this fact affords unmistakable demonstration that the military armaments, as kept up for many years under the Government of India, are far larger than are needful for the maintenance of order in India, and for the defence of the natural boundaries of the Empire. Since the invasion of Afghanistan commenced, there had been intermittent disturbances in the rural districts of the Deccan; more extensive disorder had been prevalent in the jungle districts of the northern provinces of the Madras Presidency; while on the north-east frontier of Assam a formidable raid of savage tribes had to be repelled by difficult military operations. Yet, notwithstanding a large portion of the ordinary military forces of British India—nearly one-fifth of the whole—being engaged in Afghanistan, there has been no lack of military force to keep up sufficient garrisons in India and engage in three special operations in widely distant portions of the Empire. The petitioners therefore submitted that when the Afghan difficulty shall have been overcome a strong case will exist for a substantial reduction in the military forces hitherto kept up under the Government of India, and that thereby very large relief may be given from the pressure of unproductive expenditure. A copy of the Memorial, together with the reply, is inserted in Vol. XIII., page 146, of the *Journal* of the Association.

EDUCATION IN INDIA: A CASE FOR INQUIRY.

On the 5th of May, 1881, a well-attended meeting was held at the Rooms of the Association, under the presidency of Sir William Hill, K.C.S.I., when the Rev. James Johnston read a paper on "Education in India: a Case for Inquiry," the purport of which was to show that the lines laid down by Lord Halifax in the Education Despatch of 1854 have been ignored or disregarded in the twenty-six years' operation of the Act. The elementary education of the humbler classes in India was the chief aim of the designers of the Act, and the efforts and the funds at the disposal of the Indian Government were to be directed specially to the education of the poor; yet of the small sum of 750,000*l.* set apart from the Imperial Treasury for educational purposes last year, the higher culture obtained the lion's share. The result is seen in the fact that of the 27,000,000 persons in British India of school age there are not more than 1,500,000 on the roll of the Government and aided schools, and little more than 1,000,000 in regular attendance. Every year increases the disproportion, and there were 3,500,000 more uneducated children in 1880 than there were in 1854. In conclusion, Mr. Johnston urged that a case had been made out for in-

quiry by Government into the working and results of the Education Code in India. A discussion followed the reading of the paper, which is reported in Vol. XIII., page 113—145, of the *Journal* of the Association. As members are aware, a special Commission to conduct such inquiry has been appointed.

LAND TENURES IN BOMBAY.

On the 21st December, 1881, a well-attended meeting was held in Doughty Hall, in the rear of the Association's new Offices, for the purpose of considering the various Land Tenures in the Bombay Presidency. Mr. G. Noble Taylor occupied the chair.

Mr. Alexander Rogers read a paper on the subject, and explained the various ancient and modern tenures current in Bombay. As a general impression prevailed that tenures in which middlemen of various degrees of proprietary right holding an intermediate position between the State and the actual tillers of the soil have been ruthlessly extinguished, and all the agricultural population reduced to one dead level of tenants holding directly from the State, Mr. Rogers showed that not only was this not the case, but that, on the contrary, with a single exception, the unwisdom of which has been clearly proved, existing tenures have been not only upheld, but fortified and improved. Only where the holding of land directly from the State has been customary has the ryotwaree system of the Bombay Revenue survey and settlement been introduced in its entirety. After a full description of the Bombay Revenue survey system, Mr. Rogers contended that, *pace* the advocates of the village settlement system, it provides as favourable a tenure, consistently with the right of the State to derive a fair land-tax from its domains, as can well be conceived. A discussion followed the reading of the paper, which will be found inserted at full length in the *Journal* of the Association, pages 1—25 of the present volume.

INDIAN AND OTHER FOREIGN PRODUCTIONS IN SILVER, AND WHY THEY ARE VIRTUALLY PROHIBITED FROM IMPORTATION INTO THE UNITED KINGDOM.

A largely-attended meeting was held in Doughty Hall, on Wednesday evening, January 18, 1882, under the presidency of the Right Honble. Sir Arthur Hobhouse, Q.C., K.C.S.I., C.I.E., for the purpose of considering an address by Mr. Edward J. Watherston on the subject of "India and the Silver Trade."

Mr. Watherston explained at length the fiscal and other hindrances which beset the British manufacturers of silver or gold plate, and which virtually prohibit importation of Indian and other foreign silver

wares into the United Kingdom. It must, he said, often have occurred to colonists — Anglo-Indians more especially — that it is strange that the beautiful workmanship of native productions in silver, to be found not only in India but in Japan, should not be appreciated in England. It is but little known that this supposed want of appreciation is wholly caused by prevailing legislation, which has imposed unjust and impolitic hindrances, subversive of the principles of modern fiscal policy and obstructive to art progress, and forming an insurmountable obstacle to technical education in its application to silversmith's work. In 1855 the weight of silver upon which the duty was paid amounted to 994,360 ounces; in 1880 it had fallen to 638,620 ounces; so that during a quarter of a century of unparalleled national prosperity, the output of the British silversmith has fallen by an amount of more than one-third. So long, also, as a law remains in force that before an article is put together, almost in its rough state, it must be sent to the Hall, and a duty of from 12½ to 20 per cent. be paid upon it, it is useless to hope for an improvement in the technical education of the silversmith. In conclusion, Mr. Watherston urged that the duties upon gold and silver plate, together producing only 50,000*l.* per annum to the Exchequer, should be abolished with as little delay as possible, in conformity with the recommendations of the Select Committee on Hall-marking in 1879; and that hall-marking of gold and silver plate should be a voluntary institution, as now prevails in the use of gold and silver jewellery; foreign plate, like foreign jewellery, being admitted free from any legislative interference. This would lead to a revival of one of the most ancient and beautiful of British industries, while, at the same time, it will develop a trade with India which should become of much importance. A discussion, in which the learned Chairman took a prominent part, followed the reading of the paper, a report of which will be found at full length in the *Journal* of the Association, pages 26—55 of the present volume.

INAUGURATION OF THE NEW PRESIDENT.

On Monday afternoon, March 13th, 1882, Sir Richard Temple, Bart., G.C.S.I., delivered an address to the members of the East India Association, on accepting the office of President. Having adverted to the importance of the Association, in which his immediate predecessor had been Sir Lawrence Peel, Sir R. Temple said he could assure them that India was changing as fast as any country in Europe, and that would be more and more the case every year. He classed the subjects to which attention should be constantly

directed by the Association as material, moral, and social. Of the former, the most important was the application of British capital to the development of the resources of India. That would be partly private and partly public; the sphere of action for the former being the making of cheap railways, and of the latter, the extension of irrigation works, which could only be successfully undertaken by the Government. Sanitation was a subject which should be earnestly impressed on all concerned; also the cultivation and preservation of forests, which were sorely needed both for their climatic effect and to supply fuel, so that manure, instead of being burnt, might be applied to its legitimate purpose of restoring the failing fertility of the soil. They had already the greatest Forest Department in the world in India, but it was small compared with the wants of the country. With regard to land, they should constantly attend to the extension of tenant-right to the millions of ordinary cultivators. Something might be done by the Association regarding emigration from the over-populated districts of India, by communicating information in regard to the Indian labour market to the agents here of such colonies as Madagascar, the Mauritius, Natal, and South America. On the opium question, too, they might do much to correct the mistaken views of the excellent and benevolent people who were agitating the matter in this country. In regard to moral and social matters in which this Association might be beneficial to the people of India, the chief was education. On that he would say that the high education given, partly by the Government and partly by private missionary institutions, had been fraught with blessings to the upper classes of the Natives, improving them morally and intellectually; and therefore the Association should not countenance those who disparaged that in favour of primary education. Missionary effort had done all it could; but with all its zeal and energy, it was inadequate to the need, and therefore Government must do a great deal; for the want was still great, especially in the interior of the country, of an increased number of colleges. The system of Government paying half, and the people paying half the cost of this high art education had worked well, and it should be the object now for the Government to offer a large number of scholarships to be competed for by the more talented youths of slender means throughout the Empire. In regard to trade, he was glad to hear from India of the remission of duties on Indian articles imported from England, and he would suggest to the Association the duty of enforcing something like reciprocity, by urging the remission of duties on Indian articles imported here. Reverting for a moment to education, Sir Richard Temple said that he

was sanguine that much might be done to improve the education of native women and girls, and he commended the subject to educated English ladies as one in which they might exert a graceful and beneficial influence. Referring next to Christian missions in India, he testified to their advantages, both on religious grounds and for their moral, social, and political effect on the Natives. Much good might be done by the Association in systematising the statistics of India, which were all carefully pigeon-holed in various departments. Also, the admission of the Natives to the Covenanted Civil Service should be advocated: the great object of our education should be to fit them to become administrators, for till that was done we should not have done our duty by them. They should endeavour, also, as much as possible, to advocate honorary public functions being assigned to Natives, such as honorary magistrates and judges, assessors in civil cases, and jurors in criminal cases, their appointment being made, wherever practicable, by the election of their fellow-countrymen. He had carried out that principle in Calcutta, in filling the offices of municipal commissioners, with the happiest results. In conclusion, he advised the Association to avoid Central Asian politics, which had, unfortunately, become in this country a matter of party strife; while their object should be to work with both parties, and also to create a favourable impression on Native gentlemen visiting England by making their stay agreeable.

The Inaugural Address will be found inserted at full length in the *Journal* of the Association, pages 57—76 of the present volume.

BY WHOM IS INDIA GOVERNED ?

On Thursday afternoon, March 23rd, 1882, a meeting of the members and friends of the Association was held in Doughty Hall, under the presidency of Mr. Alderman R. N. Fowler, M.P., when Mr. John Dacosta read a paper on "By Whom is India Governed?"

Mr. Dacosta pointed out that the system of administration under which India is governed has not been materially modified since its adoption in 1858-61; nor has any inquiry been instituted to ascertain how far the machinery then established has served its intended purposes. The history of the last fifteen years records instances of Indian Secretaries of State having, under a strained interpretation of the Acts, omitted to consult the Council of India in cases where by law they should have done so; supported the Governor-General in overruling his Council in ordinary matters under a clause intended only for extraordinary cases of urgency; and, by directing definite pieces of legislation to be enacted by the Legislative Council irrespective of

the opinion entertained by that Council, deprived the Indian Legislature of its essential and most valuable attribute as a deliberative body. Mr. Dacosta urged that the failure of the system under which India has been governed since 1868 has been due to the inadequacy of the means which were then devised for the protection of her revenues, and for the wholesome control of the extensive powers vested in the Secretary of State ; and he contended that the remedy for some of the most serious errors might be found in a reorganization of the Legislative Councils such as would prepare the way for introducing into them a true and substantial representation of the people, and render it impossible for their decisions to be dictated by the Executive, as at present. In short, the successful administration of India requires a reasonable amount of self-government and a corresponding modification of the all-absorbing power now centred in an authority stationed thousands of miles from India, unacquainted with the country and its inhabitants, and subject to the influences of a Cabinet and a Parliament whose interests are frequently at variance with those of India.

A discussion followed the reading of the paper, which will be found inserted at full length in the *Journal* of the Association, pages 77—118 of the present volume.

PAPERS IN THE "JOURNAL."

The Council have published the following Papers in the *Journal* :—

"Popular Representation in India." By Sir DAVID WEDDERBURN, Bart., M.P.

"England and India." By DINSHA D. DAVAR, Esq.

"A Court of Appeal for Indian Grievances." By Lord STANLEY OF ALDERLEY.

"The Retention of Candahar, and the Defence of the North-west Frontier." By Lieut.-Colonel JAMES BROWNE, R.E., C.S.I.

"Education in India: a Case for Inquiry." By the Rev. JAMES JOHNSTON.

"Land Tenures in Bombay." By ALEXANDER ROGERS, Esq.

"Indian and other Foreign Productions in Silver, and why they are virtually Prohibited from Importation into the United Kingdom." By EDWARD J. WATHERSTON, Esq.

"By Whom is India Governed?" By JOHN DACOSTA, Esq.

LOSSES BY DEATH.

It is with great regret the Council record the deaths of one of the Vice-Presidents of the Association—Major-General Sir G. Le Grand

Jacob, C.B., K.C.S.I.—and of a member of the Council—Major-General Sir Vincent Eyre, C.B., K.C.S.I. The following members of the Association have also died since our last Report: General Sir John Low, Lieut.-General W. F. Marriott, Major-General Robert Shaw, John Whitwell, Esq., M.P., J. David Bell, Esq., H. Martin Blair, Esq., General Colin Maekenzie, and Lord Frederick C. Cavendish, M.P. Most or all of these took a warm interest in the work of the Association, and in the affairs of India generally.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS.

The following gentlemen have been elected Members of the Association since the last meeting: Gopinath Sadasewje, Esq.; E. A. Sheshadri, Esq.; Dinsha D. Davar, Esq.; John Courtland Anderson, Esq.; D. D. Cama, Esq.; William Alexander Hunter, Esq.; M. D. Dadysett, Esq.; Albert Grey, Esq., M.P.; Arthur Cohen, Esq., M.P.; George Palmer, Esq., M.P.; Major-General Sir Henry Marshman Havelock-Allan, Bart., M.P.; Charles Alfred Elliot, Esq.; E. Grey, Esq.; Dr. George Flower Trimmell; Ootool Churn Mullick, Esq.; Major-General F. Applegath; William McGuffin, Esq.; Major-General F. R. Maunsell, R.E.; General Sir Alexander Taylor, R.E., K.C.B.; Jeremiah Ryan, Esq.; Lieut.-General Crawford Cooke; B. Sashagiri, Esq.; William Digby, Esq., C.I.E.; Alexander Rogers, Esq.; John Shaw, Esq.; Syed Muhammad Meer, Esq.; Syud Mahomed Israil, Esq.; Chunder Nath Banerjee, Esq.; William Carlton Wood, Esq.; John Dacosta, Esq.; E. J. Khory, Esq.; Magnus Mowatt, Esq.; Colonel Robert M. Macdonald; Settna E. Manockjee, Esq.; A. Govindau, Esq.; and A. K. Sethna, Esq.

The following gentlemen have been elected Members of the Council since the last meeting: Rajah Rampal Singh; O. C. Mullick, Esq.; W. Martin Wood, Esq.; M. D. Dadysett, Esq.; John Dacosta, Esq.; Alexander Rogers, Esq.

According to the terms of Article 8, all the members of the Council now retire. They are eligible for re-election.

PUBLICATIONS.

The Council tender their best thanks to the Proprietors of the following Papers, who present copies for the use of the Reading-room, where they may be daily read by members of the Association:—

<i>The Aligurh Institute Gazette</i>	Aligurh.
„ <i>Native Opinion</i>	Bombay.
„ <i>Times of India</i>	„
„ <i>Indian Spectator</i>	„

<i>The Indu-Prakash or Moonlight</i>	Bombay.
„ <i>Friend of India and Statesman</i>	Calcutta.
„ <i>Hindu Patriot</i>	„
„ <i>Indian Daily News</i>	„
„ <i>East</i>	Dacca.
„ <i>Home and Colonial Mail</i>	London.
„ <i>Journal of the Society of Arts</i>	„
„ <i>Journal of the Royal United Service Institution</i>	„
„ <i>Journal of the Statistical Society</i>	„
„ <i>Journal of the National Indian Association</i>	„
„ <i>Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute</i>	„
„ <i>Proceedings of the Literary and Philosophical Society</i>	Liverpool.
„ <i>Proceedings of the Literary and Philosophical Society</i>	Manchester.
„ <i>Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institution</i> ...	Washington, U.S.

The Council will be glad to receive and file, at their Office, other journals and periodicals, both from India and elsewhere.

ACCOUNTS.

The Accounts for the three years, from 1st May, 1879, to 30th April, 1882, have been audited, and will be found in the Appendix.

The List of Life Members will be published in a future number of the *Journal*.

GENERAL ABSTRACT OF ACCOUNTS OF THE EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION.

CASH ACCOUNT, from 1st May, 1879, to 30th April, 1880.

DR.			RECEIPTS.			EXPENDITURE.			CR.		
1879.						1880.					
May 1.—To BALANCE at Bankers			£	s.	d.	April 30.—By Rent			£	s.	d.
" in hand			64	5	10	Housekeeper, Coal, and Gas			23	1	5
Subscriptions received in London			1	19	10	Salaries (£100 and £112)			28	6	5
Advertisements in the <i>Journal</i> and						Printing			212	0	0
Sundry Receipts						Reporting and Paragraphing			72	1	0
Interest on Investments in London						Newspapers and Books			27	12	8
" in India						Bookbinding			11	7	3
						Stationery			2	15	6
						Postage			4	13	0
						Advertising			8	13	2
						Freight on Publications to India			7	0	6
						BALANCE at Bankers			2	17	1
						" in hand			608	11	7
									81	13	11
									3	17	10
									85	11	9

BALANCE SHEET, April 30, 1880.

ASSETS.			LIABILITIES.		
	£	s. d.		£	s. d.
Investments in England: Rs. 10,900 in 4 per Cent. Loan of 1875..	1,044	4 5			
Furniture and Fixtures, London.....	197	4 0			
Library	106	7 0			
Balance of Bank and Cash Account	85	11 9			
	<u>£1,433</u>	<u>7 2</u>	General Fund Balance carried forward	£1,433	7 2

16th November, 1881.

Examined with Ledger and Vouchers, and found correct.
(Signed) A. ARATHOON.
P. FIRIE GORDON.

W. HAMILTON BURN, Acting Secretary.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS

Who have Paid their Subscriptions from May 1, 1879, to April 30, 1880.

	For	£ s. d.
Ahsanuddin Ahmed, Esq.	1880	1 5 0
Vincent Ambler, Esq.	"	1 5 0
George Appleton, Esq.	"	1 5 0
C. W. Arathoon, Esq.	"	1 5 0
J. P. C. Anderson, Esq. ..	"	1 5 0
General Sir George Balfour, K.C.B., M.P.	"	1 5 0
M. T. Bass, Esq., M.P.	1879-80	2 2 0
Sir Stewart Colvin Bayley, K.C.S.I.	1880	1 5 0
J. David Bell, Esq. (the late)	1877-79	3 15 0
Major-General James Black.	1879-80	2 10 0
H. M. Blair, Esq. (the late).	1880	1 5 0
H. B. Boswell, Esq.	1879-80	2 10 0
St. John Buchan, Esq.	1880	1 5 0
J. R. Bullen-Smith, Esq., C.S.I.	1879-80	2 10 0
Major-General G. Burn	1880	1 5 0
H. A. M. Butler-Johnstone, Esq.	"	1 5 0
J. Scarlett Campbell, Esq.	"	1 5 0
General Sir Orfeur Cavenagh, K.C.S.I.	"	1 5 0
Lord F. C. Cavendish, M.P. (the late)	1879-80	2 10 0
Sir T. E. Colebrooke, Bart., M.P.	1880	1 1 0
John Corbett, Esq., M.P.	"	1 5 0
General Sir Arthur Cotton, K.C.S.I.	"	1 5 0
Juland Danvers, Esq.	"	1 5 0
Dinsha D. Davar, Esq.	"	1 5 0
Emerson Dawson, Esq.	"	1 5 0
V. K. Dhairyan, Esq.	1879	1 5 0
W. Pirie Duff, Esq.	1879-80	2 10 0
Robert H. Elliot, Esq.	1880	1 5 0
Lieut.-Colonel H. L. Evans	1879	1 5 0
Colonel W. E. Evans.	1880	1 5 0
Major-General Sir Vincent Eyre, K.C.S.I. (the late)	"	1 5 0
R. E. Forrest, Esq.	1877-79	3 15 0
Sir T. Douglas Forsyth, K.C.S.I.	1879-80	2 10 0
Alexander Fowler, Esq.	"	2 10 0
H. W. Freeland, Esq.	1880	1 5 0
Lieut.-Colonel P. T. French	"	1 5 0
Major-General W. A. Fyers, C.B.	"	1 5 0
Gopinath Sadasewji, Esq.	"	1 5 0
W. Grant, Esq.	"	1 5 0
Sir Robert Hamilton, Bart., K.C.B.	"	1 5 0
Alfred J. Holiday, Esq.	"	1 5 0
A. R. Hutchins, Esq.	"	1 5 0
Maj.-Gen. Sir G. Le Grand Jacob, K.C.S.I. (the late)	"	1 5 0
Charles Jay, Esq.	"	1 5 0
John Jones, Esq.	1879-80	2 10 0

	For	£	s.	d.
General Sir Arnold Kemball, K.C.B., K.C.S.I.	1880	1	5	0
General Lord Mark Kerr, K.C.B.	1879-80	2	10	0
Abul Hassan Khan, Esq.	1879	1	5	0
Henry Kimber, Esq.	1880	1	5	0
Colonel W. Nassau Lees	1877-80	5	0	0
Rev. James Long	1879-80	2	8	0
General Sir John Low, G.C.B. (the late)	1880	1	0	0
S. P. Low, Esq.	"	1	5	0
Lord Lyttelton	1880	1	5	0
General Colin Mackenzie, C.B. (the late)	"	1	5	0
Dr. M. D. Makuna	1878-79	2	10	0
General Sir George Malcolm, K.C.B.	1880	1	5	0
William Markby, Esq.	"	1	5	0
Hugh Mason, Esq., M.P.	1879	1	5	0
Francis Mathew, Esq.	1879-80	2	10	0
James Matthews, Esq.	1880	1	5	0
Mirza Peer Bukhsh, Esq.	1879	1	5	0
S. V. Morgan, Esq.	1880	1	5	0
V. N. Narisimmiangar, Esq.	1879	1	5	0
Miss Florence Nightingale	"	1	5	0
Rev. Harman C. Ogle	Life	14	0	0
Major-General J. G. Palmer	1880	1	5	0
Captain W. C. Palmer	"	1	5	0
George Palmer, Esq.	"	1	5	0
T. G. A. Palmer, Esq.	"	1	5	0
John Pender, Esq., M.P.	"	1	5	0
Colonel A. Phelps	"	1	5	0
Colonel A. B. Rathborne	"	1	5	0
Major-General W. Richardson, C.B.	"	1	5	0
Raja Rampal Singh	"	1	5	0
James Routledge, Esq.	"	1	5	0
The Most Hon. the Marquis of Salisbury, K.G.	"	1	0	0
R. D. Sassoon, Esq.	1879-80	1	5	0
Major-General E. W. S. Scott	1880	1	5	0
Syed Sharifudin, Esq.	1879	1	5	0
D. H. Small, Esq.	"	1	0	0
St. John Stephen, Esq.	1879-80	2	10	0
Field-Marshal the Right Hon. Lord Strathnairn ...	1880	1	5	0
David Sutherland, Esq.	"	1	5	0
R. B. Swinton, Esq.	"	1	5	0
G. M. Tagore, Esq.	"	1	5	0
P. M. Tait, Esq.	Life	14	0	0
William Tayler, Esq.	1878-79	2	10	0
Thomas Taylor, Esq.	1880	1	5	0
Sir Charles Trevelyan, Bart., K.C.B.	"	1	5	0
Sir David Wedderburn, Bart., M.P.	"	1	5	0
T. Luxmore Wilson, Esq.	1878-79	2	10	0
Sir Roland K. Wilson, Bart.	1880	1	5	0
Sir Charles J. Wingfield, K.C.S.I.	1877-80	5	5	0
James T. Wood, Esq.	1880	1	5	0

GENERAL ABSTRACT OF ACCOUNTS OF THE EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION. CASH ACCOUNT, from 1st May, 1880, to 30th April, 1881.

ANNUAL MEETING.

219

DR. 1880.	RECEIPTS.		EXPENDITURE.		CR. £ s. d.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	1881.	£ s. d.	
To BALANCE at Bankers	81 13 11	81 13 11	April 30.—By Rent	175 0 0	
" in hand	3 17 10	85 11 9	Housekeeper, Coal, and Gas	27 15 11	
Subscriptions received in London		108 6 0	Salaries (£112 10s. and £123 10s.)	236 0 0	
Advertisements in <i>Journal</i> , and Sundry Receipts		15 11 3	Printing	58 10 6	
Interest on Investments in London		35 14 8	Reporting and Paragrapping	32 16 8	
" in India		376 9 7	Newspapers and Books	12 16 6	
			Stationery	9 5 4	
			Postage	12 10 0	
			Advertising	8 13 6	
			Freight on Publications to India	1 9 5	
			Hire of Room	26 5 0	
			Sundry Expenses	2 2 0	603 4 10
			BALANCE at Bankers	16 1 6	
			" in hand	2 6 11	18 8 5
					£621 13 3

BALANCE SHEET, April 30, 1881.

ASSETS.		LIABILITIES.	
£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Investments in England: Rs. 10,000 in 4 per Cent. Loan of 1875 ..	1,044 4 5		
Furniture and Fixtures, London	197 4 0		
Library	106 7 0		
Balance of Bank and Cash Account	18 8 5		
	£1,366 3 10	General Balance Fund carried forward	£1,366 3 10

Examined with Ledger and Vouchers, and found correct.

PATRICK PIRIE GORDON.
(Signed) A. ARATHOON.

16th November, 1881.

W. HAMILTON BURN, *Acting Secretary.*

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS

Who have Paid their Subscriptions from May 1, 1880, to April 30, 1881.

	For	£	s.	d.
Ahsanuddin Ahmed, Esq.....	1881	1	5	0
J. P. C. Anderson, Esq.	"	1	5	0
Major-General F. Applegath	"	1	5	0
A. Arathoon, Esq.....	1880	1	5	0
C. W. Arathoon, Esq.	1881	1	5	0
General Sir George Balfour, K.C.B., M.P.	"	1	5	0
Sir Stewart Colvin Bayley, K.C.S.I.	"	1	5	0
H. B. Boswell, Esq.	"	1	5	0
J. R. Bullen-Smith, Esq., C.S.I.	"	1	5	0
Major-General G. Burn.....	"	1	5	0
H. A. M. Butler-Johnstone, Esq.	"	1	5	0
D. D. Cama, Esq.	1880	1	5	0
J. Scarlett Campbell, Esq.	1881	1	5	0
General Sir Orfeur Cavenagh, K.C.S.I.	"	1	5	0
Arthur Cohen, Esq., Q.C., M.P.	1880-81	2	10	0
Sir T. E. Colebrooke, Bart., M.P.....	1881	1	1	0
J. J. Colman, Esq., M.P.	1880-81	2	10	0
John Corbett, Esq., M.P.	1881	1	5	0
General Sir Arthur Cotton, K.C.S.I.	"	1	5	0
M. D. Dadysett, Esq.	1880	1	5	0
Juland Danvers, Esq.	1881	1	5	0
Emerson Dawson, Esq.....	"	1	5	0
W. Pirie Duff, Esq.	"	1	5	0
C. A. Elliott, Esq.....	1880-81	2	10	0
Lieut.-Colonel H. L. Evans	1880	1	5	0
Colonel W. E. Evans	1881	1	5	0
Major-General Sir Vincent Eyre, K.C.S.I. (the late)	"	1	5	0
Alexander Fowler, Esq.	"	1	5	0
H. W. Freeland, Esq.	"	1	5	0
Lieut.-Colonel P. T. French	"	1	5	0
Major-General W. A. Fyers, C.B.	"	1	5	0
Willie Grant, Esq.....	"	1	5	0
Albert Grey, Esq., M.P.	1880-81	2	10	0
Sir Robert Hamilton, Bart., K.C.B.	1881	1	5	0
General Sir Henry Havelock-Allan, Bart., K.C.B...	1880-81	2	10	0
Alfred J. Holiday, Esq.	1881	1	5	0
W. A. Hunter, Esq.	1880-81	2	10	0
A. R. Hutchins, Esq.	1881	1	5	0
Maj.-Gen. Sir G. Le Grand Jacob, K.C.S.I. (the late)	"	1	5	0
Charles Jay, Esq.	"	1	5	0
General Lord Mark Kerr, K.C.B.	"	1	5	0
Abul Hossan Khan, Esq.	1880	1	5	0
Henry Kimber, Esq.....	1881	1	5	0
S. P. Low, Esq.	"	1	5	0
Lord Lyttelton	"	1	5	0

	For	£	s.	d.
General Colin Mackenzie, C.B. (the late)	1881	1	5	0
General Sir George Malcolm, K.C.B.	"	1	5	0
William Markby, Esq.	"	1	5	0
Hugh Mason, Esq., M.P.	1880	1	5	0
James Matthews, Esq.	1881	1	5	0
Major-General F. R. Maunsell.....	"	1	5	0
William McGuffin, Esq.	"	1	5	0
S. V. Morgan, Esq.	"	1	5	0
O. C. Mulliek, Esq.	"	1	5	0
Major-General J. G. Palmer	"	1	5	0
Captain W. C. Palmer	"	1	5	0
George Palmer, Esq., M.P.	1880-81	2	10	0
George Palmer, Esq.....	1881	1	5	0
T. G. A. Palmer, Esq.	"	1	5	0
John Pender, Esq., M.P.	"	1	5	0
Colonel A. Phelps	"	1	5	0
Colonel A. B. Rathborne	"	1	5	0
Major-General W. Richardson, C.B.	"	1	5	0
Raja Rampal Singh	"	1	5	0
The Most Hon. the Marquis of Salisbury, K.G.....	"	1	0	0
Major-General E. W. S. Scott.....	"	1	5	0
St. John Stephen, Esq.	"	1	5	0
Field-Marshal the Right Hon. Lord Strathnairn ...	"	1	5	0
R. B. Swinton, Esq.	"	1	5	0
G. M. Tagore, Esq.	"	1	5	0
Thomas Taylor, Esq.....	"	1	5	0
General Sir Alexander Taylor, K.C.B.	"	1	5	0
Sir Charles Trevelyan, Bart., K.C.B.	"	1	5	0
Dr. G. F. Trimnell	1880-81	2	10	0
Sir David Wedderburn, Bart., M.P.	1881	1	5	0
Sir Roland K. Wilson, Bart.	"	1	5	0
The Executors of the late J. P. Wise, Esq.	1877-79	3	15	0

£108 6 0.

GENERAL ABSTRACT OF ACCOUNTS OF THE EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION.

CASH ACCOUNTS, from 1st May, 1881, to 30th April, 1882.

DR. 1881.	RECEIPTS.		EXPENDITURE.		CR. 1882.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	
May 1.—To BALANCE at Bankers.....	16 1 6		April 30.—By Rent	137 10 0	
" " in hand.....	2 6 11	18 8 5	Housekeeper, Coal, &c.	27 9 2	
Subscriptions received in London.....		140 4 0	Salaries (£37 ros. and £104 ros.).....	142 0 0	
Remittance from Bombay Branch		251 11 3	Printing	81 12 0	
Advertisements in the <i>Journal</i> , and Sundry Receipts.....			Reporting and Paragraghing	39 11 0	
Interest on Investments in London		20 5 6	Hire of Hall for Lectures	6 6 0	
" " in India		35 12 6	Newspapers and Books.....	8 14 8	
		369 13 7	Bookbinding	8 14 0	
			Stationery	6 6 2	
			Postage	12 10 3	
			Advertising	2 19 6	
			Expenses of Removing	12 6 6	485 19 3
			BALANCE at Bankers	344 7 3	
			" in hand	5 8 9	349 16 0
					£835 15 3

BALANCE SHEET, April 30th, 1882.

ASSETS.

£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Investments in England, Rs. 10,000 in 4 per Cent. Loan of 1875	1,044 4 5
Furniture and Fixtures, London	197 4 0
Library	106 7 0
Balance of Bank and Cash Account.. ..	349 16 0
	£1,697 11 5

19th May, 1882.

Examined with Ledger and Vouchers, and found correct.

(Signed) JOHN SHAW.

P. PIRIE GORDON.

W. HAMILTON BURN, Acting Secretary.

LIABILITIES.

£ s. d.

General Fund Balance carried forward £1,697 11 5

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS

Who have Paid their Subscriptions from May 1, 1881, to April 30, 1882.

	For	£ s. d.
Vincent Ambler, Esq.	1881	1 5 0
J. P. C. Anderson, Esq.	1882	1 5 0
Major-General F. Applegath	"	1 5 0
A. Arathoon, Esq.	"	1 5 0
C. W. Arathoon, Esq.	"	1 5 0
J. H. W. Arathoon, Esq.	1880-81	2 10 0
General Sir George Balfour, K.C.B., M.P.	1882	1 5 0
C. N. Banerjee, Esq.	"	1 5 0
M. T. Bass, Esq., M.P.	1881-82	2 14 0
Sir Stewart Colvin Bayley, K.C.S.I.	1882	1 5 0
Major Evans Bell	1880-81	2 10 0
H. B. Boswell, Esq.	1882	1 5 0
J. R. Bullen-Smith, Esq., C.S.I.	"	1 5 0
Major-General G. Burn	"	1 5 0
H. A. M. Butler-Johnstone, Esq.	"	1 5 0
D. D. Cama, Esq.	1881-82	2 10 0
A. H. Campbell, Esq. (<i>Journal</i>)	1878-81	1 0 0
J. Scarlett Campbell, Esq.	1882	1 5 0
General Sir Orfeur Cavenagh, K.C.S.I.	"	1 5 0
Arthur Cohen, Esq., Q.C., M.P.	"	1 5 0
Sir T. E. Colebrook	"	1 1 0
Lieut.-General Crawford Cooke	1881-82	2 10 0
John Corbett, Esq., M.P.	1882	1 5 0
General Sir Arthur Cotton, K.C.S.I.	"	1 5 0
John Dacosta, Esq.	"	1 5 0
M. D. Dadysett, Esq.	1881-82	2 10 0
Juland Danvers, Esq.	1882	1 5 0
William Digby, Esq., C.I.E.	"	1 5 0
W. Pirie Duff, Esq.	"	1 5 0
Robert H. Elliot, Esq.	"	1 5 0
C. A. Elliott, Esq.	"	1 5 0
Lieut.-Colonel H. L. Evans	1881	1 5 0
Colonel W. E. Evans	1882	1 5 0
H. W. Freeland, Esq.	"	1 5 0
Lieut.-Colonel P. T. French	"	1 5 0
Major-General W. A. Fyers	"	1 5 0
W. Grant, Esq.	"	1 5 0
Albert Grey, Esq., M.P.	"	1 5 0
Sir Robert Hamilton, Bart., K.C.B.	"	1 5 0
General Sir Henry Havelock-Allan, Bart., K.C.B.	"	1 5 0
Alfred J. Holiday, Esq.	"	1 5 0
W. A. Hunter, Esq.	"	1 5 0
A. R. Hutchins, Esq.	"	1 5 0
R. M. Holborn, Esq. (<i>Journal</i>)	"	2 2 0
Charles Jay, Esq.	"	1 5 0

	For	£	s.	d.
John Jones, Esq.	1881	1	5	0
General Sir Arnold Kemball, K.C.B., K.C.S.I.	"	1	5	0
General Lord Mark Kerr, K.C.B.	1882	1	5	0
E. J. Khory, Esq.	"	1	5	0
Henry Kimber, Esq.	"	1	5	0
Rev. James Long	1881-82	2	11	0
S. P. Low, Esq.	1882	1	5	0
Lord Lytton	"	1	5	0
Colonel B. M. M.	"	1	5	0
H.H. the Rajah of Macher	1881	1	5	0
General Sir George Malcolm, K.C.B.	1881	1	1	0
William Markby, Esq.	"	1	5	0
Hugh Mason, Esq., M.P.	1881-82	2	10	0
James Matthews, Esq.	1882	1	5	0
Major-General F. R. Maunsell, R.E.	"	1	5	0
William McGuffin, Esq.	"	1	5	0
Syed Muhammad Meer, Esq.	"	1	5	0
S. V. Morgan, Esq.	"	1	5	0
Magnus Mowatt, Esq.	"	1	5	0
O. C. Mullick, Esq.	"	1	5	0
Miss Florence Nightingale	1881-82	2	10	0
Major-General J. G. Palmer	1882	1	5	0
Captain W. C. Palmer	"	1	5	0
George Palmer, Esq., M.P.	"	1	5	0
George Palmer, Esq.	"	1	5	0
T. G. A. Palmer, Esq.	"	1	5	0
Peer Bukhsh, Esq.	"	1	5	0
John Pender, Esq., M.P.	"	1	5	0
Colonel A. Phelps	"	1	5	0
Rajah Rampal Singh	"	1	5	0
Colonel A. B. Rathborne	"	1	5	0
Major-General W. Richardson, C.B.	"	1	5	0
Alexander Rogers, Esq.	"	1	5	0
Jeremiah Ryan, Esq.	1881-2	2	10	0
The Most Honble. the Marquis of Salisbury, K.G.	1882	1	0	0
R. D. Sassoon, Esq.	1881-2	2	10	0
Major-General E. W. S. Scott.	1882	1	5	0
John Shaw, Esq.	"	1	5	0
St. John Stephen, Esq.	"	1	5	0
Field-Marshal the Duke of Cambridge	"	1	5	0
David Sutherland, Esq.	1881	1	5	0
R. B. Swinton, Esq.	"	1	5	0
G. M. Tagore, Esq.	1882	1	5	0
William Tayler, Esq.	1880	1	5	0
Thomas Taylor, Esq.	1881	1	5	0
General Sir Alexander Taylor, K.C.B.	"	1	5	0
Sir Charles Trevelyan, Bart., K.C.B.	"	1	5	0
Dr. G. F. Trimmell	"	1	5	0
Sir David Wedderburn, Bart., M.P.	"	1	5	0
T. Luxmore Wilson, Esq.	1880-81	2	10	0
Sir Roland K. Wilson, Bart.	1882	1	5	0
W. Carlton Wood, Esq.	"	1	5	0
W. Martin Wood, Esq.	"	1	5	0

TO THE RIGHT HON. THE MARQUIS OF HARTINGTON,
M.P., P.C., HER MAJESTY'S SECRETARY OF STATE
FOR INDIA.

The humble Memorial of the Council of the East India Association

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH :

That the manufacture and chasing of gold and silver utensils and ornaments is one of the ancient art industries of India. It is still practised at Trichinopoly and other parts of the Madras Presidency, at Kutch, and in other parts of Western India; also at Delhi and Agra. In Kaskmir the art exists, and its products are, or might be, largely exported from India; but the expansion of these artistic industries in India is virtually prohibited by the heavy Customs' duty that is levied in this country on gold and silver plate, other than filigree and jewel work. Although these Indian articles, wrought in the precious metals, are often brought to this country by private purchasers, who are willing to pay the high duty for their own gratification, that duty effectually prevents any mercantile business being conducted in these articles, and there is, therefore, no inducement for the Natives of India to extend that valuable and remunerative industry.

That the attention of the Association has recently been directed to the impolicy of the laws relating to the manufacture and sale of gold and silver plate in the United Kingdom, and to the fiscal and other impediments to art progress prevailing in those trades.

That the attention of the Association has also been specially directed to the fact that, by the law of compulsory hall-marking, the importation of Indian and other foreign gold and silver manufactures (other than jewellery) is virtually prohibited, inasmuch as, although such manufactures can be brought into the United Kingdom upon payment of the Customs' duty of 17s. per ounce gold, and 1s. 6d. per ounce silver, they cannot legally be exposed for sale unless hall-marked at one of the various assay offices—a process which, as it involves “the scrape and parting assay,” damages the articles in such a way as to render a return to the workshop absolutely necessary, and in many instances, when the workmanship is of an elaborate character, injures them past hope of recovery.

That the duties upon gold and silver plate were unanimously condemned by the Select Committee on Hall-marking (1879), who recommended that they should be abolished (both Customs and Excise) as soon as the state of the revenue should permit.

That the same Committee, by a majority of only one, approved of

the principle of compulsory hall-marking, but that, voting in the minority for perfect freedom of trade in the precious metals, are to be found the names of Mr. Goschen, Mr. Leonard Courtney, Mr Thomson Hankey, and the late Mr. Whitwell.

That the Committee, although approving of the principle of compulsion as applied to hall-marking, recommended a thorough reform of the laws; and the President of the Board of Trade has already indicated the desire of Her Majesty's Government to proceed with such reform as soon as the state of public business may permit.

That, before any Bill for a reform of the hall-marking laws can be submitted to Parliament, it is obviously necessary that the trades should be free from taxation, inasmuch as it cannot be denied that the present practice of compulsory hall-marking is a sure and certain protection to the revenue, and that it would be impolitic in the highest degree to alter the law until the duties shall have been abolished.

That it is of the utmost importance to the social progress of India that greater variety of industries shall be encouraged; but the existence of the English import duty of more than 20 per cent. on gold plate and 33 per cent. on silver articles tends to destroy all chance of prosperity amongst the Indian craftsmen who work in the precious metals.

That, in the opinion of this Association, it is most desirable that the duties upon gold and silver plate should be abolished in April next, so as to pave the way for the Board of Trade to deal with the subject of hall-marking in the Session of 1883.

Your Memorialists therefore humbly pray that Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India may, in the interests especially of Indian manufactures, use his influence with the Chancellor of the Exchequer in order to obtain the abolition of the duties upon gold and silver plate in the forthcoming session of Parliament.

And your Memorialists will ever pray, &c.

For the Council of the East India Association,

(Signed) PATRICK P. GORDON.
JAMES LONG.
O. C. MULLICK.
C. W. ARATHOON.
WM. MARTIN WOOD.

W. HAMILTON BURN, *Acting Secretary.*

24th March, 1882.

East India Association, 14, Bedford Row, W.C.,
May 2, 1882.

DEAR SIR,—On the 24th March last I had the honour to forward to the Right Hon. the Marquis of Hartington a Memorial praying that the Duties upon Indian Gold and Silver Plate be abolished; not having had a reply, I am desired by the Council of this Association to ask the favour of an acknowledgment of the Memorial.

I am, Sir,

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) W. HAMILTON BURN, *Acting Secretary*.

R. B. BRETT, Esq., M.P.,
INDIA OFFICE, S.W.

Reply.

(R. S. & C., 876.)

India Office, S.W.,

May 6, 1882.

SIR,—In reply to your letter of the 2nd instant, I am directed to inform you that the Memorial of the East India Association relative to the Duties on Indian Gold and Silver Plate was duly received, and is at present under the consideration of the Secretary of State in Council. An official communication on the subject will shortly be made to you.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Signed) F. C. DANVERS, *Assistant Secretary*,
Rev. Stat. & Com. Department.

The Secretary,
EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION,
14, BEDFORD ROW, W.C.

Reply.

(R. S. & C., 611.)

India Office, S.W.,

11th May, 1882.

SIR,—I am directed by the Secretary of State for India in Council to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 24th March, enclosing a Memorial of the East India Association relative to the Duties on Indian Gold and Silver Plate, and to the question of compulsory hall-marking.

In reply, I am to inform you that the Memorial has, by Lord Hartington's directions, been forwarded for the consideration of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury.

You will have observed from the report of Mr. Gladstone's recent financial statement that no action in regard to the duties on plate can be taken during the current financial year.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Signed) LOUIS MALLET.

The Secretary,
EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION,
14, BEDFORD ROW, W.C.

TO THE RIGHT HON. WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE, M.P.,
FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY AND CHANCELLOR
OF THE EXCHEQUER.

The Memorial of the Council of the East India Association

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH :

1. That your Memorialists are greatly disappointed that Her Majesty's Government have decided not to abolish the duties upon gold and silver plate in the present Session of Parliament.

2. That your Memorialists have seen, with much satisfaction, that Her Majesty's Government are fully alive to the mischievous effect of the Excise duty, as, in this country, "limiting industry, "lowering the standard of our manufactures, and obstructing the progress of taste in design."

3. That they are fully aware that Her Majesty's Government are anxious to abolish the Customs' duty, as being diametrically opposed to the interests of Her Majesty's Indian subjects, especially now that by the recent Budget all restrictions are removed from the free import of gold and silver wares, of foreign production, into Her Majesty's Empire of India.

4. That your Memorialists also fully understand that Her Majesty's Government, although willing to forego the small revenue derived from the duties upon gold and silver plate (Customs and Excise), are, nevertheless, not prepared to face the demand on the part of manufacturers and retail dealers for a drawback of duties upon existing stocks; seeing, first, the difficulty of assessing the amount of such drawback; secondly, that of paying it in the case of a commodity so distributed over the entire country; and thirdly, the possibility of fraud in the attempt to participate in that drawback.

5. But your Memorialists venture respectfully to urge, as an

obvious argument of comparison worthy of the consideration of Her Majesty's Government, that no drawback at all has been allowed by Her Majesty's Indian Government in respect of the recent sweeping abolition of Customs' duties consequent on the large free-trade measure known as the Honourable Major Baring's Budget. Very heavy losses, immeasurably far greater than could possibly accrue to British goldsmiths and silversmiths, wholesale or retail, by the abolition of the duties on gold and silver plate, have been suffered by the holders of duty-paid stocks of salt, of cotton goods, and European commodities of all kinds in India, by the sudden abolition of the Customs' duties. During the month of March, on an average of three years, the aggregate amount of import duty paid through the Indian Custom-houses has been about 30 lakhs of rupees. It seems fair to estimate that at least one month's and probably two months' stocks of duty-paid goods were in the hands of dealers in India when the recent wholly unexpected abolition of Customs' duties was announced; thus representing a sacrifice by the trading classes of India of from 300,000*l.* to 600,000*l.* Your Memorialists make no complaint on behalf of the Indian traders, because it has long been well understood, when remissions of duty are made in favour of the consumer, that merchants and dealers must sustain the temporary loss incidental to such beneficial change. But your Memorialists may be permitted to point out that no grant of drawback in respect of the duties on gold and silver plate that could justly be proposed would amount to anything like the losses now being quietly sustained by traders in India.

6. That your Memorialists further submit that British goldsmiths and silversmiths cannot urge a plea of "suddenness," inasmuch as the agitation for the repeal of the gold and silver duties has prevailed for nearly five years; that these imposts have been condemned by a Select Committee of the House of Commons, and by the Press of the United Kingdom, by several members of Her Majesty's present Government, and by several of the learned and scientific societies of the country.

7. That, further, during these years of agitation against these taxes, manufacturers and dealers have "starved their stocks," and, therefore, that there could be no better time than the present for abolishing the duties. Your Memorialists feel confident that, in the interests of the gold and silversmiths themselves, it would be far better for them that the duties should be abolished at once, rather than that the agitation for their repeal should be maintained during the coming year.

8. That if Her Majesty's Government were to abolish the duties, such would be the increase of trade, any loss made by manufacturers

and dealers would be more than recouped by the increased profits arising from improved business.

9. That your Memorialists, lastly, urge that, even when the duties have been abolished, it remains for an Act of Parliament hereafter to be passed, so to alter the hall-marking laws as to permit the free importation of foreign gold and silver plate, and that no such Act can be introduced by the Department of the Board of Trade until the duties shall first have been abolished. Your Memorialists, therefore, having regard to the importance of preserving and encouraging the artistic industries of Indian artificers in gold and silver ware, as duly set forth in their former Memorial, humbly pray that Her Majesty Government may reconsider the supposed difficulty about the drawback, and may decide to abolish the Customs' and Excise duties upon gold and silver plate at once; thus following the same course that has been adopted in all remissions of Customs' and Excise duties since 1842. Your Memorialists submit that the prompt and complete abolition of these duties, which are so directly prohibitory of important products of Indian art and industry, would be a fitting sequence to the removal of import duties on English manufactures just carried out in India.

And your Memorialists will ever pray, &c.

For the Council of the East India Association,

(Signed) PATRICK P. GORDON, J.P.

WM. MARTIN WOOD.

C. W. ARATHOON.

M. D. DADYSETT.

O. C. MULLICK.

14, Bedford Row, W.C.

19th May, 1882.

Reply.

10, Downing Street, Whitehall,

May 20, 1882.

Sir,—I am directed by Mr. Gladstone to inform you that he has received the communication from the East India Association on the subject of the Plate Duties, which you have done him the honour to forward to him.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Signed) G. LEVESON GOWER.

W. HAMILTON BURN, Esq., *Acting Secretary.*



JOURNAL

OF THE

EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION.

Instituted for the independent and disinterested advocacy and promotion, by all legitimate means, of the public interests and welfare of the Inhabitants of India generally.

Indian Trade and Finance: Past, Present, and Prospective.

PAPER BY W. PIRIE DUFF, Esq., F.R.G.S.,

READ AT A MEETING OF THE EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION,
MAY 31st, 1882.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY
IN THE CHAIR.

A MEETING of the members and friends of the East India Association was held at Doughty Hall, Bedford Row, in the rear of the Chambers of the Association, on Wednesday afternoon, May 31st, 1882; the subject for consideration being "Indian Trade and Finance; Past Present, and Prospective," introduced in a paper by W. Pirie Duff, Esq., F.R.G.S.

The Right Honourable Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY occupied the chair, and amongst those present were the following: Right Hon. W. E. Baxter, M.P.; Sir Joseph and Lady Fayrer; General Sir Orfeur Cavenagh, K.C.S.I.; Major-General G. Burn; Major-General D. S. Dodgson, C.B.; Colonel Hughes; Colonel R. H. Keatinge, C.S.I., V.C.; Colonel R. M. Macdonald; Major Fenwick; Major Home; Captain W. W. Ross; Dr. Farquharson, M.P.; Mr. J. R. Bullen-Smith, C.S.I.; Rev. Samuel Dyson, D.D.; Rev. James Long; Rev. Professor Smith, D.D.; Mr. Abdul Ali; Mr. A. Arathoon; Mr. C. W. Arathoon; Mr. Mancherjee M. Bhowmaggree; Mr. Borradaile; Mirza Peer Bukhsh; Sheik Abdul Bussole; Mr. Carmichail; Mr. S. Cochrane; Mr. D. C. Creaton; Mr. M. D. Dadysett; Mrs. and Misses Drysdale; Mr. and Mrs. W.

Duff Bruce; the Misses Duff; Mr. K. B. Dutt; Mr. Robert H. Elliot; Mr. and Mrs. Freer; Mr. D. Ghose; Mrs. Gilligan; Mr. Thomas Grant; Mr. and Mrs. Jamieson; Mr. E. J. Khory; Mr. William McGuffin; Mr. J. E. Modi; Mr. Peel; Mr. Alexander Rogers; Mr. A. K. Settna; Mr. Challoner Smith; Mr. and Mrs. Sparks; Mrs. Kenneth Stuart and party; Mr. Lawrence Watson; Mrs. Watson; Miss Watson; Mr. William S. Whitworth; Mr. W. Carlton Wood; Mr. W. Martin Wood; Mr. W. Hamilton Burn (Secretary).

The noble CHAIRMAN briefly introduced the lecturer to the meeting.

Mr. W. PIRIE DUFF—who explained that, owing to an attack of illness, he had been unable to complete his paper, and that, in fact, his presence at all was contrary to his medical attendant's advice—read a portion of his paper, but, as he was manifestly suffering under great personal inconvenience, Mr. P. Pirie Gordon kindly volunteered to read the remainder.

Mr. W. PIRIE DUFF said: In the course of this paper I intend to follow the sound and judicious advice given to us by our distinguished President in his inaugural address on the 13th of March. I shall, although discussing Indian finance, refuse to touch even the fringe of that *vexata questio*, Bi-metallism, and I shall endeavour to avoid all mere crotchets and hobbies. All such debateable questions as, for example, the removal of the ecclesiastical establishments in India—a question Mr. Baxter has made his own—I shall carefully steer clear of, as this is neither the time nor the place for such a discussion.

And here it is proper to say, by way of hearty acknowledgment, that but for the information available to me in three remarkable books, I never could have compiled this paper. I name them in the order in which they reached me; and I would add, they should be in the hands (for purposes of reference) of all who desire to keep themselves intelligently *au courant* of India and its progress. They are Sir R. Temple's "India in 1880," the remarkable volume compiled by the brothers Sir John and General Strachey, and Dr. Hunter's invaluable *vade mecum*, "The Indian Empire," a digest, in readily accessible form, of the fuller information to be found in his large Gazetteer of India. I must further add the debt of obligation I owe to Mr. Waterfield, of the India Office, by whose kind courtesy and friendly aid I have been enabled to bring my comparisons of Indian trade and finance down to the very latest date.

If, before I have finished, I touch upon disputable ground of taxation, I beg you to believe I do so with diffidence, and only tentatively, in order to elicit discussion which may be at once interesting and instructive. My subject is "Indian Trade and Finance: Past, Present, and Prospective," and questions collaterally related thereto. I have thought this a favourable opportunity for endeavouring to traverse, once and for all, the peculiar views entertained as to India, and its value as a possession of Great Britain, by the late Mr. Cobden, and, as we now learn from his Biography, endorsed by Mr. Bright and Mr. Morley. While I shall, to the utmost of my ability, avail myself of all the information obtainable from the three works named at the outset to combat and, if possible, rebut views that, in my humble judgment, are eminently pernicious, I hope no word shall be allowed to fall from me inconsistent with the reverence I feel for the immortal services rendered to Free Trade by Mr. Cobden, with the respect and admiration I feel for Mr. Bright as a consummate orator and a consistent friend of the people's cause, and, lastly, with the regard I entertain for Mr. Morley as a great power in the intellectual and political life of England.

On taking a purview of the trade statistics of India, the first feature that strikes us is its wonderful expansion and development under the fostering care of British rule. Always from remote ages a commercial nation, its annual exports previous to our assuming the government of the empire did not exceed 1,000,000*l.* sterling. In 1880, the total volume of trade, embracing both exports and imports, had reached a total of 122,000,000*l.* Now, let us compare this result with the trade of the principal nations of the world, and we shall find India is outstripped by four only:—

Great Britain, with its enormous figure of, roughly	£615,000,000
France.....	313,000,000
United States	226,000,000
Belgium	184,000,000

Russia and Austria-Hungary stand about on a level with, say, 133,000,000*l.* and 128,000,000*l.* respectively, while Italy is left far behind with 84,000,000*l.* The whole of the Australian colonies taken together represent a trade of about 70,000,000*l.*

These figures will enable you to realize the pre-eminent position India occupies in the world of commerce. And here let me pause and place before you the particular views of Mr. Cobden, Mr. Bright, and Mr. Morley, to which I have already adverted.

COBDEN ON INDIA.

At page 205 of the second volume of Mr. Morley's remarkable Biography you will find Mr. Cobden's own words given as he wrote them on the 16th October, 1857, to his friend Mr. Ashworth :—

“ I am, and always have been, of opinion that we have attempted an “ impossibility in giving ourselves to the task of governing 100,000,000 “ of Asiatics.” [Had Mr. Cobden been alive now, I suppose he would have found this argument fortified by the fact that we are now governing nearly 250,000,000.] “ God and His visible natural laws “ have opposed insuperable obstacles to the success of such a scheme. “ But if the plan were practicable at the great cost and risk which we “ now see to be inseparable from it, what advantage can it confer on “ ourselves ? We all know the motive which took the East India “ Company to Asia : monopoly, not merely as towards foreigners, but “ against the rest of their own countrymen. But now that the trade “ of Hindustan is thrown open to all the world on equal terms, what “ exclusive advantage can we derive to compensate for all the trouble, “ cost, and risk of ruling over such a people ? ” Strange words, surely, these to have fallen from the great apostle of Free Trade !

He continues : “ Unfortunately for me, I cannot even co-operate “ with those who seek to ‘ reform ’ India, for I have no faith in the “ power of England to govern that country at all permanently.” Then he asks, writing under the panic caused by the terrible Mutiny : “ Who will live in the interior of India, in future, beyond the range of “ our forts or the sound of the regimental drum ? Certainly no one “ with wife and children to care for. . . . No ; there is no future but “ trouble, and loss, and disappointment, and, I fear, crime in India ; “ and they are doing the people of this country the greatest service “ who tell them the honest truth according to their convictions, and “ prepare them for abandoning at some future time the thankless and “ impossible task.” If Mr. Cobden be right in his opinion, then assuredly this Association has no *raison d'être*.

To his illustrious colleague in the Corn Law controversy, Mr. Bright, he writes in the same year : “ It is impossible that a people “ can permanently be used for their own obvious and conscious “ degradation. The entire scheme of our Indian rule is based upon “ the assumption that the Natives will be the willing instruments of “ their own humiliation. Nay, so confident are we in this faith, that “ we offer them the light of Christianity and a free press, and still “ believe that they have wit enough to measure their rights by our “ own standard. . . . I confess to you that I have no faith in the

“ doctrine that by any possible reforms we can govern India well, or continue to hold it permanently. God and nature have put a visible and insuperable obstacle in the way of our rash and audacious scheme. . . . But the future—what is in the distance? The most certain and immediate result is, that we shall have a bankrupt empire of 150,000,000 of people on our back. The end of this year will leave the Company minus not much short of 100,000,000*l.* sterling, including guaranteed railways, &c. . . . I never could feel any enthusiasm for the reform of our Indian Government, for I failed to satisfy myself that it was possible for us to rule that vast empire with advantage to its people or ourselves. I now regard the task as utterly hopeless. Conquerors and conquered can never live together again with confidence or comfort. It will be a happy day when England has not an acre of territory in Continental Asia.”

Then he seems to feel he is going a little too far, and pulls himself up, adding: “ How such a state of things is to be brought about is more than I can tell. I bless my stars that I am not in a position” [he had lost his seat in the House of Commons at the General Election of March, 1857, brought on by the success of the coalition vote against Lord Palmerston on the China War] “ to be obliged to give public utterance to my views on the all-absorbing topic of the day, for I could not do justice to my own convictions and possess the confidence of any constituency in the kingdom. For where do we find even an individual who is not imbued with the notion that England would sink to ruin if she were deprived of her Indian Empire? Leave me, then, to my pigs and sheep, which are not labouring under any such delusions.”

To Colonel Fitzmager, on the 18th October of the same year, 1857, he writes: “ Shall we give education to India, or reform its criminals, or abate its crime, or moderate its religious bigotry and intolerance? Can we do these things at home? If a Board of Works cannot give us a common sewer for London, is it likely to cover India with canals for irrigation? If Catholic and Protestant cannot live together in Belfast excepting under something like martial law, are we the people to teach charity and toleration to the Hindu?” He adds, with a truth the force of which he did not see at the time, nor does his distinguished biographer apparently see it now: “ For a politician of my principles there is really no standing ground.” Then he continues: “ The manufacturers of Yorkshire and Lancashire look upon India as a field of enterprise which can only be kept open to them by force; and, indeed, they are willing apparently to be at all the cost of holding open the door of the whole of Asia

“for the rest of the world to trade on the same terms as themselves. “How few of those who fought for the repeal of the Corn Laws “really understand the full meaning of Free Trade principles!” May we not add, how strange that so great a master of economic science should have been so grievously at fault when he came to apply his principles to India!

He goes on: “If you talk to our Lancashire friends, they argue “that unless we occupied India, there would be no trade with that “country, or that somebody else would monopolize it; forgetting that “this is the old protectionist theory which they used formerly to “ridicule. India was a great centre and source of commerce for the “civilized world before Englishmen took to wearing breeches, and it “was the renown of its wealth and productiveness which first attracted “us there. I am by no means so clear as some people, that we have “added greatly to its commerce. Certainly the trade of European “countries has increased in a greater ratio than that of India during “the last century.”

To Mr. Combe, on the 16th May, 1858, he writes: “I am afraid “our national character is being deteriorated, and our love of freedom “in danger of being impaired, by what is passing in India. Is it “possible that we can play the part of despot and butcher there “without finding our character deteriorated at home? Were not “the ancient Greeks and Romans corrupted and demoralized by their “Asiatic conquests; and may we not share their fate, though in a “different way? . . . It is more and more my conviction that the “task of governing *despotically* 150,000,000 of people at a distance of “12,000 miles” [he had apparently forgotten that Bombay is distant barely 7,000 miles] “cannot be executed by a constitutional government.”

Later on, in August, 1860 (the very month in which his great ally in the battle for the vindication of economic truths, Mr. James Wilson, died in Calcutta), he writes from Paris to Mr. Hargreaves: “To confess the truth, I have no heart for discussing any of the “*details* of Indian management, for I look on our rule there, as a whole, “with an eye of despair. . . . Meantime, we shall suffer all kinds of “trouble, loss, and disgrace. Every year will witness an increased “drain of men and money to meet the loss entailed on us. In the “meantime, too, an artificial expansion of our exports, growing out “of Government expenditure in India, will delude us as to the value “of our ‘possessions’ in the East. . . . It is, however, from an “abiding conviction in my mind that we have entered upon an “impossible and hopeless career in India, that *I can never bring my “mind to take an interest in the details of its government.*”

I confess, Sir, as a humble but loyal member of the Cobden Club, I read these sentiments with a sense of mortification and dismay; and the first reflection that passed through my mind was, "How unfortunate that Mr. Morley should ever have given an abiding place to sentiments uttered under the strained feelings due to so exceptional a period as that of the Indian Mutinies!" But when I looked at the preface, I read these words: "Mr. Bright has allowed me to consult him constantly, and has abounded in helpful corrections and suggestions while the sheets were passing through the press."

It is sad enough to see these pessimist views of Mr. Cobden apparently shared by Mr. Bright and Sir Louis Mallet, but, to my mind, it is of far sadder and more serious import that they should be shared by Mr. Morley. However much one may differ from Mr. Morley on some subjects, we must all recognize the forward and commanding position he holds in the intellectual and political life of England. I can only reconcile such a man committing himself at this time of day to sentiments uttered by Mr. Cobden nearly a quarter of a century ago, on the supposition that his mind has been so absorbed in questions of home politics, and in his loved field of French literature, that he has never had the time or opportunity to master questions of Indian policy. I think I do him no injustice in associating him with Mr. Cobden's views when I quote the following words with which, among others, he prefaces his ninth chapter of the Biography: "As a military and despotic government, as an acquisition of impolitic violence and fraud, as the seat of unsafe finance, for these and other reasons, he (Mr. Cobden) had always taken his place among those—and" [mark particularly the next clause of the sentence] "*they were much fewer then than they are now*—who cannot see advantage either to the Natives or their foreign masters in this vast possession."

Now, my Lord, I propose to answer Mr. Cobden from two sources. One will be the information derived from the works already named, the other will be by placing in juxtaposition the sentiments of a greater master of economic science than Mr. Cobden, Mr. Bright, or Mr. Morley; I refer to the late lamented Mr. James Wilson, from whose advent in Calcutta, at the fall of 1859, as Indian Chancellor of the Exchequer, I date the commencement of what I may call the modern era of Indian finance.

I cannot approach the name of Mr. Wilson without tendering my homage—respectful, but unaffected and sincere—to one who, but for his untimely death, would, I believe, have rendered services to India of a magnitude equal to those that have won immortal renown for

the long list of illustrious warriors and statesmen whose names adorn the bead-roll of India's greatest benefactors.

One has only to recall the fact that he was barely a brief nine months in India to realize (after perusing his great initial speech, and the minutes that flowed from his facile pen on all manner of fiscal subjects) how, had his life been spared, he would have been the Gladstone of Indian finance; and I know no higher fame to bestow upon his name.

I remember the day of his arrival in Calcutta, and I have a vivid recollection of the day he died and was buried. His arrival was in 1859, on the anniversary of the great Scotch festival dedicated to the national patron saint, St. Andrew. It was a season of depression. The wave of mutiny had receded. The last embers of the flame had been threshed out by Lord Clyde in Oude and Rohilkund, and the country found itself beginning a new start, burdened with an enormous national deficit.

It was to extricate India from the terrible financial embarrassments the mutinies had brought upon her that Mr. Wilson sacrificed a splendid career at home, and cheerfully abandoned his high position in the House of Commons. Then came his Budget day. All at once felt we were in the hands of a master of finance. "He spoke" as one having authority." The universal sentiment was, "However black may be our present prospects [in 1860], our deliverer is at hand, and at the helm." Unfortunately for India, Mr. Wilson would insist on working as he had worked at home. In vain, his medical advisers besought him to desist from his favourite English practice of working late into the night. His zeal consumed him. He lost sight of the trying conditions of an Indian climate. Always fond of horse exercise, he seemed to think the daily gallop on the Calcutta Maidan, or in the park at Barruckpore, would recuperate him as it had so often done in the Row in Hyde Park.

August came, and with it rumours spread that that fell disease—next to cholera, the most destructive to European life in India—dysentery, had laid its hand on the great Indian Chancellor of the Exchequer. All that the highest medical skill could do was done; loving hearts and tender hands ministered to his needs; but all in vain; and on Sunday, the 11th of August, one of those dismal mornings in the rainy season, all that was mortal of the great master of finance passed away. That day was a day of gloom, as universal and deep as had been the feeling of joy and hope on the day of his arrival.

I do not disparage the services rendered to India by his successors,

Mr. Laing, Sir Charles Trevelyan, the late Mr. Massy, Sir William Muir, Sir Richard Temple, Sir John Strachey, and now Major Baring; but this I will say, that in the untimely loss of Mr. Wilson, India was deprived of the greatest financier that ever guided its fiscal policy.

I can make allowance for Mr. Cobden. He wrote under excitement, and at a time when the ignorance of India, even on the part of leading public men, was profound. But I find it difficult to make any excuse for Mr. Morley and his friends. True, Sir Richard Temple's and Sir John Strachey's books had not been given to the public at the time the Biography was being compiled; but Dr. Hunter's Gazetteer was available to all who sought for and desired information, and Mr. Wilson's great Budget speech of 1860 had been available for reference for over twenty years.

Let us look somewhat in detail at the marvellous development achieved by India under her "despots and butchers" during the last twenty-five years.

Why, my Lord, of the whole shipping employed in the external trade of India, 88½ per cent. is British. The Peninsular and Oriental Steamship Company, to whom India owes so much, has a fleet now of just double what it was in 1857, and a class of vessels altogether more powerful for the rapid and efficient working of the mail service.

Within a shorter period, and within my own recollection, the mercantile genius, energy, and enterprise of Mr. William Mackinnon, of Ballinakill, has called into existence the British India Steam Company, with a fleet of seventy-two steamers, large and small, representing a tonnage of 141,000 tons; while there are now building, for the same Company, six new steamers, with an aggregate of 14,800 tons, which will give, when they are floated, a fleet of seventy-eight steamers, and a gross tonnage of 156,129 tons.

Then look at what we have achieved in the way of railway communication almost within a period dating only from the year when Mr. Cobden delivered himself so dogmatically of his opinion as to the worthlessness and hopelessness of our rule in India. Dr. Hunter writes: "The following are the railway statistics of India for the year 1878: Total length of lines opened for traffic, 8,215 miles, of which 6,044 miles belong to guaranteed railways, and 2,171 miles to State railways; total capital expended, 115,059,000*l.*, being (roughly) 95,000,000*l.* on the former and 19,000,000*l.* on the latter class; number of passengers conveyed (perhaps, I would add, the most marvellous fact of all when its civilizing influences are appreciated), 38,500,000; total number of tons of goods and minerals,

“ 8,171,000; number of live-stock, 594,000; gross receipts, 10,404,000*l.*; gross expenses, 5,206,000*l.*; net earnings, 5,197,000*l.*; percentage of gross expenses to gross receipts, 50·04, varying from 34·97 in the case of the East Indian main line to an average of 78·27 for all the State lines. These figures show one mile of railway to every 109 square miles of area, as compared with the area of British India, or to about each 180 square miles, as compared with the area of the entire peninsula. The average cost of construction per mile is almost exactly 14,000*l.* On the 31st March, 1879, the total length opened was 8,545 miles; and the capital invested, 120,000,000*l.* sterling.”

And yet, forsooth, we are to be told by one of the men of “light and leading” in English politics that the number is increasing of those who “cannot see any advantage, either to the Natives or their foreign masters, in this vast possession”! I leave the Metropolitan Board of Works to answer the sneer about its inability to construct a “common sewer for London,” and I accept the challenge put forward in the question, “Is it likely to cover India with canals for irrigation?” I answer, in Dr. Hunter’s words: “During the ten years ending March, 1878, a total sum of 10,457,000*l.* was expended on irrigation, under the Budget heading of ‘Extraordinary,’ as compared with 18,636,000*l.* expended on State railways in the same period; total, 29,000,000*l.* In 1879 the total had risen to about 32,000,000*l.*”

The percentage of irrigation to cultivation is, in Sind, 80 per cent.; North-west Provinces and Oude, 32 per cent.; Punjab, 26 per cent.; Madras, 23 per cent.; Mysore, 16 per cent. And Dr. Hunter adds: “Irrigation is most resorted to in the provinces with the scantiest or most precarious rainfall.” I hope Mr. Cobden’s question as to irrigation is thus answered to the satisfaction of Mr. Bright, Mr. Morley, and others.

For the farther enlightenment of those who fail to see any advantage to the Natives or their foreign masters in the vast possession of India, I will look for a little at its commerce and trade. Quoting Dr. Hunter again: “Under British rule, a new era of production has arisen in India, an era of production on a great scale, based upon the co-operation of capital and labour, in place of the small household manufactures of ancient times.

“At the beginning of the last century, before the English became the ruling power in India, the country did not produce 1,000,000*l.* a-year of staples for exportation. During the first three-quarters of a century of our rule the exports slowly rose to about 10, 000,000*l.* in 1834. During the half-century from that date the old inland

“duties and other remaining restrictions on Indian trade have been abolished. Exports have multiplied by sixfold. In 1880 India sold to foreign nations 66,000,000*l.* worth of strictly Indian produce which the Indian husbandman had raised, and for which he was paid. In that year the total trade of India, including “exports and imports, exceeded 122,000,000*l.*” That is my answer to the confident assertions that there is “no future but trouble and loss and disappointment in India”—that we shall have “a bankrupt empire upon our back;” to the strange, almost incredible, statement that he (Mr. Cobden) was “by no means so clear as some people, that we have added greatly to its commerce;” and that the “trade of European countries has increased in a greater ratio than that of India during the last century.” And a farther answer, again, in Dr. Hunter’s words, is: “India sells over 21,000,000*l.* a year more of her own staples to foreign nations than the merchandise that she buys for herself from them. She takes payment of one-third of the balance, or, say, 7,000,000*l.* on good government, and so secures that protection to person and property which she never had before, and which alone has rendered her industrial development possible. With another third, or 7,000,000*l.*, she pays for the capital with which she has constructed the material framework of that development—pays for it at the lowest interest, and pays for it, not in cash, but in her own products. The remaining 7,000,000*l.* she receives in gold and silver, and puts them in her purse.” So much for Mr. Morley’s dictum, that it is the country of “unsafe finance.”

But time would fail me to produce all the evidence I have to rebut the astounding ideas of Mr. Cobden, Mr. Bright, and Mr. Morley; the materials are really inexhaustible. Why, my Lord, in 1840—44 the average of her imports of cotton manufactures was but 3·19; in 1875—79 it had risen to 19·29. Its exports of raw cotton had risen from 1·68 in 1845—49 to 25·98 in 1865—69 (owing to the abnormal demand created by the American war of secession), although it had fallen to 11·52 in 1875—79. Dr. Hunter could not have seen Mr. Morley’s life of Mr. Cobden when he wrote his *Gazetteer*, and yet, as if to anticipate and answer Mr. Cobden’s crude and jejune judgment, he writes: The above table “shows a rapid and steady growth, which “only finds its parallel in the United Kingdom.”

And now let us glance first at the trade, and then at the finance of India. Excluding treasure, the volume of Indian trade for each of the following quinquennial periods was taken roughly:—

1834-35—1838-39.....	£	...£16,000,000
1839-40—1843-44.....		... 22,000,000

1844-45—1848-49.....	...£25,000,000
1849-50—1853-54.....	... 26,000,000
1854-55—1858-59.....	... 38,000,000
1859-60—1863-64.....	... 66,000,000
1864-65—1868-69 107,000,000
1869-70—1873-74... 97,000,000
1874-75—1879-80.....	... 96,000,000

These figures are surely enough to convince the most obdurate that the trade of India is progressing in a way almost to justify the application of Mr. Gladstone's famous expression, when speaking of the inflated years at home (1872—74), that it is advancing by "leaps and strides."

Leaving out the years 1864-65—1868-69, as representing a period of altogether abnormal energy and activity, due to the American War, you have a continuous and progressive growth.

Mr. ROBERT H. ELLIOT rose and said that in order to open the discussion without delay, he would offer a few remarks, although he would not address the meeting at any length. He said that the interesting lecture they had just heard was entitled "Indian Trade and Finance: Past, Present, and Prospective." He had not time, nor did he think it essential for him, to revert to the past; but with reference to the present, he thought he might say with confidence, at the present moment, and confining the attention to the present year, that, according to the existing state of things, Indian finance might be considered in a fairly satisfactory position. (Hear, hear.) But when he turned to the future, to the "prospective," several questions naturally arose, and these he would attempt briefly to state, as they were points which should be clearly set forth before they attempted to form any definite opinion on the subject before the meeting. The questions he would put he hoped those interested in Indian affairs would turn over in their minds, and on future occasions give the Association the benefit of their opinions respecting them. He put them in this way. As regarded famines, first, what was the prospect of their future effect on Indian finance? Could anybody say that famines in the future would not be as great and as onerous as in the past, and such as to place Indian finance in a different position? He had property in the province of Mysore, and what he had seen and learned during his acquaintance with that part of India had shown him the great peril of India as regarded famines. Literally, in a year or two years, a province previously in a satisfactory financial position might be thrown into great difficulty. If this was true of one province, it must be true of

India generally. Turning to the second point, the opium revenue, could any one say that the revenue from that source was in such a condition that they could confidently look forward to it as a perpetual item of revenue? He did not doubt but that opium would continue to be sold in China, but he urged that the Chinese regard our opium much as they regard our missionaries; they do not object to opium in the abstract, but they regard it as a sign of foreign domination—indeed, they look upon it very much as the Spaniards regard our occupation of Gibraltar. It would be remembered that opium and missionaries were introduced into China at the close of a war; and, as Sir Rutherford Alcock had said, the Chinese looked upon the introduction of opium and missionaries as the result of that war; therefore, it was highly probable that the Chinese Government would take, the moment they felt strong enough to do so, the opportunity of levying such a tax on our opium, that it would extinguish the revenue which the Indian Government obtained from that drug. That, of course, might be a matter of opinion; but, at the same time, the prospects were such that before they could fairly say Indian finance was in a satisfactory position, they ought to be able to say that the opium revenue was a source of income to be relied upon as certainly as the revenue from land. Again, there was a third point, which, in his opinion, as a practical agriculturist both in this country and in India, was very important, so important that no person not actually experienced in the cultivation of the soil would be able to correctly estimate. This was: “Is the agricultural position satisfactory?” He had not the slightest hesitation in saying it was quite the reverse. This was so because the soil was becoming rapidly exhausted. No doubt many present had heard of this; and although it was proceeding by slow steps, it was none the less certain. Nor was this exhaustion of the land confined to India. We in England were suffering from the same cause; and in proof of this, he pointed to the agricultural journals, adding that he had personally experienced the same thing in Scotland, for he had known land which was wont to produce thirty tons of turnips, &c., so reduced as to produce only fifteen tons. And if this was the case in England, where we have so much skill and capital spent on the soil, what must be the condition of the land in India? This process had been going on steadily in India; and unless they could see their way out of such a condition, they were not in a position to talk satisfactorily about Indian finance. Therefore, while he did not doubt the statements made by Mr. Duff as regarded trade and other matters, he urged that they should not draw from the paper any very favourable opinion of the future prospects of Indian finance.

Mr. M. D. DADYSETT said he felt there was little hope of expecting the future financial condition of India practically improved unless a better control was provided in the disbursement of the finances than that which was furnished by the present system of administration. The net receipts of the Indian revenue, which may be said to be stationary and inelastic, were derivable from six sources—viz., land, opium, salt, customs, excise, and stamps. As to the land revenue, it is admitted that the land is overburdened with taxation, and that it cannot be increased. More than that, it is generally conceded that the agricultural population have good grounds for their complaint, not only as to the weight of the land-tax, but as to the manner of its collection. Beyond this, there was reason for dissatisfaction when it was remembered that almost the whole amount of land revenue, which is one of the main and principal items in the receipts of the revenue of India, was, year after year, spent in England in paying the interest on Indian debt, in the purchase of stores, salaries, pensions, and the like; and these home charges, on account of the heavy loss in exchange, considerably enhanced the grievance. As to the next source of revenue—that from opium—it has of late years shown to be on the increase, but the position is very unstable. It was impossible to say how long it would be available, or to what extent. As to the third item—the salt revenue—it was almost impossible to ask or expect an increase, the present rate of duty being about 2,000 per cent. upon the value of this necessary of life, and it formed a tax of a most grievous and unsatisfactory character upon the poorest of the people. As to the fourth item—the Customs' duties—he need not say there was nothing to expect in the way of improved revenue, but very much the reverse. It has already suffered from the import duties on cotton piece-goods being given up—an illustration of the saying that “Indian finance is again and again “sacrificed to the exigencies of English estimates,” and, he might add, to the tactics of party politics. (No, no.) At the time when the duty was repealed an excuse was brought forward that free-trade England would not allow such protective duties to be imposed; but it is less a protective duty than it is represented to be. Well, nothing could be more certain than that the removal of those duties was not demanded or expected in India; the whole of the usual vehicles of popular opinion were decidedly opposed to it. As to the fifth source of revenue—the Excise duties—there was little reason to expect material increase. For instance, some time ago, when it was resolved that tobacco should be taxed, it was found prudent to give up the idea. As to the sixth item—that from stamps—he need only say that if the

Indian Government authorities could have seen their way clear to increase the revenue from that source, they would have done it long ere this. Having thus shown the limited and stationary character of the main sources of Indian revenue, he would turn to the expenditure side of the accounts. The expenditure for a country like India was monstrously large, and a number of charges are lodged upon it which should not be allowed to continue, and would not be allowed in any system of representative government in which Indian interests were fairly regarded. The Army takes away 45 per cent. of the net revenue of India, or, in other words, the whole of the land revenue. The fact that the Army requires a great reduction cannot be better shown than by quoting the remarks of an able and distinguished statesman, the late Lord Canning, who, in one of his minutes, says "that if it were a question between imposing new and irritating taxes in India, such as the income-tax, 'danger for danger,' he would 'prefer to reduce the Army.'" And this opinion was subsequently endorsed by Lord Northbrook, a statesman who not only, when he was Governor-General of India, took the greatest and heartfelt interest in Indian affairs, but who at the present day is taking an active interest in the welfare of India. To remedy all this, the expenditure must be rigorously curtailed. It is a fact too patent to be told that India is not in a position to pay for services at the present rate of remuneration. A most important saving might be effected by more largely employing Natives in positions which are now filled by highly paid Europeans. The annual drain will be stopped if the change advocated was put into full play, as almost one-tenth of the net revenue of India has to be paid in pensions and various allowances in England, which would practically remain in India if Natives were employed. As to their fitness in the administrative as well as other branches of service, he quoted the remarks of another able and distinguished statesman, our worthy President, Sir Richard Temple, who says "that during our supremacy in India there have been in the Native States good Ministers, really capital administrators, who have adorned the service to which they belong, such as the Purneah of Mysore, the Tantia Jogh of Indore, in the past, and Sir Salar Jung of Hyderabad, Sir Dinkur Rao of Gwalior, and Sir T. Madhavrao, in the present." In support of his remarks, he begged to be excused in quoting another remark as to the last-named statesman, now Raja Sir T. Madhavrao, which is as follows: "He found Travancore in the lowest stage of degradation, 'he has left it in a model state.'" The path thus shown would eventually enable Government to diminish the debt of India, to reduce the taxation, and would cause the British rule in India

to rest on a strong footing—the contentment and happiness of the people. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. W. MARTIN WOOD said that, seeing the title of the paper, he had been anxious to get hold of it, thinking it would be a great thing to have the past, present, and prospective of Indian finance presented in one view; but, now that the paper was before them, they found the subject comparatively narrow.

Mr. W. P. DUFF here reminded the speaker that at the commencement of the meeting it had been explained that his ill-health had prevented him completing the paper.

Mr. W. MARTIN WOOD, resuming, said he would withdraw his last remark, and should now look forward for the whole paper, as it dealt with matters which he, in common with Mr. Duff, had watched for a whole series of years—not, in his case, quite since Mr. Wilson's time, but from the Budgets of Sir Charles Trevelyan, and whilst many of the points raised by Mr. Wilson's measures were still under discussion. The part of the paper they had been privileged to hear chiefly referred to the views of Mr. Cobden as stated in the record of his life by Mr. Morley. He could not but think that in this Mr. Duff had set himself to slay the slain, and that much of his argument in this direction was superfluous at this time of day. In one or two expressions used Mr. Duff seemed to feel this himself particularly when he alluded to "the strained feelings due to so exceptional a period as the Indian Mutiny." All that should be borne in mind by any one who attempted to form an estimate of Cobden's views at that time. It was only fair to do so, and it was indeed necessary, in order to understand the principles on which Cobden proceeded in referring to those matters. Mr. Duff, for instance, spoke of the fears expressed by that eminent man as to the risks and cost of England maintaining India. Well, Mr. Cobden, in common with many public men and statesmen, long subsequent to that period, were under the delusion that India had been and was an expense to England. That, as is now well known, was an entire mistake. But, no doubt, Cobden, even if he had seen as clearly as was seen now that the expense of governing India is all borne by India, would still have protested against it on political grounds, and on the principle that no country in which Europeans cannot permanently settle should be held by England. And there was one political point he would refer to in passing; Mr. Duff had given Cobden's words: "It is impossible that a people can permanently be used for their own obvious and conscious

“ degradation ;” and, again : “ It is more and more my conviction that “ the task of governing despotically 150,000,000 of people at a distance “ cannot be executed by a constitutional government.” In these two sentences they could get a fair estimate of Cobden’s equitable and impartial view of political questions. At that time nothing else was thought of but that India must be governed despotically and autocratically. It is so yet to a large extent ; but the method has been greatly modified, as seen especially in some of the recent measures formulated by the Marquis of Ripon’s Government for introducing and largely applying the system of local and provincial administration. Thus, the point of Cobden’s argument, that India was being governed despotically, is being taken away, as a much better system was being introduced. With regard to the principal contention of Mr. Duff, as to the rapid advance in the trade of India, the figures given, no doubt, were large and imposing. It was, however, to be regretted that he had not been able to put in any figures relating to Great Britain, France, and the United States ; because, after all, increase of trade was a question of comparison. He (Mr. Wood) trusted that Mr. Duff, before completing his paper, would go into that. It was not a question of actual increase, but comparative increase ; and, seeing that England, with her enlightened views as to trade and commerce, is responsible for the government and management of India, the question became one of comparison with other States, not with England herself. Great Britain, the United States, Belgium, had all increased more rapidly than India, and Russia had increased almost as rapidly in the same period. Then, it should be remembered, in going into comparisons, that it was only during the period referred to by Mr. Duff that India had benefited by the introduction of modern trade appliances ; the other countries referred to as having increased to a greater extent, having, for long previous periods, had efficient appliances for transit and communication. Then, apart from that question of comparison, it was possible for the trade of a country, especially its export trade, to increase very largely without a corresponding degree of prosperity in the country. He (Mr. Wood) most cheerfully admitted that India had increased in general prosperity, but not, he thought, in the same ratio as would be supposed from the figures given by Mr. Duff. These figures dealt with facts with which all were familiar ; they exhibit that which is seen. Mr. Duff had not dealt with those which are not seen. Take, for instance, Dr. Hunter’s attempt to make the best of that one great adverse fact, that India sends out so many more millions than Dr. Hunter, as quoted by Mr. Duff in the paper, says. “ In 1880 India sold to foreign nations 66,000,000*l.* worth of strictly

"Indian produce, which the Indian husbandman had raised, and for which he was paid." But the question was, at what rate was he paid? Everything depends on that. And if the operation of the connection between England and India is such as to cause an abnormal export from that country, it must be at a lower price and at a rate which cannot be remunerative. (Hear, hear.) It should be remembered that the exports from British India, in the years 1871—1880, exceeded the imports, everything included, by 167,000,000%. In that same period there was an addition to the debt of 53,000,000%. If to this were added the proper percentage for adjusting the figures of exports according to the principle laid down by Mr. Giffen, of the Statistical Society, which would require an addition of 15 per cent. to the valuation of exports in India, that would show that India had sent out in the ten years he had referred to 313,000,000% more than she had received. Facts such as these should not be overlooked when quoting figures to show the rapid increase in India's trade and commerce. He (Mr. Wood), in common with all well-wishers of India, was glad to see that advance, but it must be remembered it is not so profitable as would appear from the returns Mr. Duff has quoted. (Hear, hear.)

MIRZA PEER BUKHSH said he would only venture to say a few words on the subject of the important and interesting paper which Mr. Pirie Duff had contributed. The points raised by some of the preceding speakers had frequently been mentioned by him, and he had again and again spoken of the injustice of the financial arrangements between Great Britain and India. Not only were these arranged to the advantage of England—not only were taxes taken off in the interest of England, but when India claimed freedom to sell her goods, as in the case of silver art work, she is met by a prohibitory tax of 33 per cent., and a refusal to remove, out of fear of vested interests in England. As to the trade of England and India, if it was conceded that it was profitable and advantageous to India, how much more profitable was it to England? Cotton, for instance, is brought from India at 3½d. to 5½d. per lb.; in its manufactured state it is sold by England at 14d. or more, the difference representing the various profits of manufacturers, brokers, shippers, shipowners, &c. If, too, the trade of India had been increased in some respects, in others it had been destroyed by the British connection. Native industries had been destroyed, and the workers driven back upon agriculture; and agriculture having to sustain a taxation of 50 per cent., it, too, was carried on under great disadvantages, and was reduced to such a state

as to hold out a prospect, as Mr. Elliot had shown, of the gravest moment to the Indian Government. The remittances from India were of an enormous magnitude; and, as Mr. Dadysett had asked, why should that go on unchecked? The Indian people were a civil, obedient, moderate, and patient people, who deserved better treatment at the hands of their rulers than to be made to support a vast military system and an administration of foreigners. If English statesmen would be but considerate of the troubles and sufferings of the 250,000,000 of Indian people, they would honour the British rule and bless it; and this was his excuse for his constant repetition of his earnest prayer that the English people would wield their influence in the required direction. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. ALEXANDER ROGERS said that the first speaker who addressed the meeting (Mr. Elliot), in his opinion, took a rather gloomy view of Indian finance, and he desired to say a few words with regard to that gentleman's remarks. Mr. Elliot had treated the subject under three heads—viz., loss of revenue from famines, from a diminution of consumption of opium in China, and from the exhaustion of the soil. He anticipated that the famines that had already afflicted India on various occasions might occur again. Certainly that was the case. But he thought the speaker (Mr. Elliot) took rather too serious a view of the finances that had occurred. India was a country that had certain climatic influences always prevalent; it had a regular rainy season; and if Mr. Elliot would look back to past history, he would find that although famine had occurred through the failure of the monsoon in various parts of the country, there never had been a famine universally throughout India—(hear, hear)—and, therefore, to imagine that the finances of India would be seriously affected by famines in future would be to take a very gloomy view. The next point the same speaker touched upon was the opium revenue. It certainly might be said that this revenue was in some degree uncertain. Mr. Elliot considered that the Chinese looked on the introduction of opium and missionaries as signs of foreign domination, and that, as a consequence, they kicked against that foreign domination in every possible way; so that he (Mr. Elliot) anticipated that at some time or other the result would be that the Chinese would put on a prohibitive tax, and thus prevent the importation of Indian opium into their country, and so seriously affect the revenue of India. To a certain extent that might be true, but he (Mr. Rogers) thought it would be found that the Chinese nation, if they wished to eat opium, and liked the Indian opium better than what they could get in their

own country, they would have it, and if they did not get it in any other way, it would be smuggled; therefore, any serious deficit in the revenue from the prohibition of opium in China was not to be very much feared. The third point Mr. Elliot laid stress upon was the condition of agriculture generally: a subject he (Mr. Elliot) had touched on before. He appeared to be under the impression that the soil of India was exhausted, but he (Mr. Rogers) denied this.

Mr. ROBERT H. ELLIOT, interposing, said that he had not said the soil was exhausted, but likely to be exhausted.

Mr. ALEXANDER ROGERS, continuing, said he had had long experience in India, and could only say that in those parts of the country to which the monsoon extends there was no probability whatever of the soil being exhausted. He referred particularly to Gujerat, where the black cotton soil is found; also to Upper India, and, indeed, to all parts where there was a reasonable depth of soil. Of course, there would be partial famines from the absence of rain, but that the condition and prospects of agriculture were unsatisfactory, owing to the probable exhaustion of the soil, he (Mr. Rogers) could not bring himself to believe. The soils to which he had alluded had been cultivated for thousands of years, and did not yet show any signs of exhaustion, and he was confident they would go on producing almost in the same degree *ad infinitum*. Another speaker (Mr. Dadysett) had insisted that the sources of revenue in India were inelastic, and that there was no chance of improving them. He could not agree with this. As to the land revenue, for instance, he was convinced this was not inelastic. Vast regions now uncultivated would come under cultivation as the population increased. As railroads opened up the country, the land would be more and more cultivated, and the land revenue, instead of falling off, would be increased. With regard to salt, the duties had lately been much diminished, and the abolition of the inland customs' line would have the effect of introducing salt more and more into the interior of the country at a cheaper rate. Hence, instead of anticipating a decrease in the revenue from salt, he, on the contrary, thought that a considerable increase might be anticipated. With regard to Customs' duties, there was little or nothing to say. The policy of the British Government had been to abolish them as far as possible; in fact, India was now a country of free trade. As to the Excise, the same speaker had said these duties admitted of no increase. He (Mr. Rogers) was convinced that this was wrong. It had been a principle to increase the excise on liquor in order, as far

as possible, to diminish the consumption. That principle he entirely approved of; but, from his personal experience, so far from diminution being expected, an improved administration of the Excise would show a considerable increase of revenue. As to the suggestion that Natives should be more freely admitted to employment in the Government service, to this no Englishman residing in India, and having the welfare of India at heart, would object. The policy of the English Government was to encourage the Natives to improve themselves, so as to become fitted to govern themselves. Education was most liberally provided; and he was certain of this, that as time went on, and the recent decentralization policy was extended, the education of the Natives, especially those of the lower classes, would be more and more looked to, so that by degrees they would become more and more fitted to govern themselves. The result of the progress that education had already made was that the Natives themselves were beginning to feel the wish to take part in their own concerns. The recent petitions presented to the Government for the institution of local councils gave evidence of the spirit that was rising amongst them, and no person having the welfare of India at heart would object to this. Education was showing the people how they could develop the material resources of the country. Hitherto they (the people) had been accustomed to regard the Government as their "*Mā-Bāh*"—as their father and mother—but now they were beginning to feel they could help themselves. The recent decentralizing policy would have the result of leading them to take more interest in the affairs of their country, and he (Mr. Rogers) hoped to see the day, which was rapidly approaching, when local councils would be established and Natives would take part in the administration. The great difficulty that had been found hitherto was to get over the unwillingness of the Natives to do anything for themselves. It had been very difficult, as he could vouch from personal experience, to get them to take an interest in their local affairs. (Hear, hear.) He had endeavoured again and again to get people in towns to establish municipal corporations, but whether it was laziness or selfishness, or both, or any other cause, he found the greatest unwillingness on their part. As he had said before, the spread of education, he trusted, would remove this. With respect to the paper, as far as it had gone, it appeared to have been written mainly for the purpose of refuting Mr. Cobden's views. He thought there could be no doubt that as to what Cobden said, the old saying would be very aptly applied—that it would be better not to prophesy until you knew. Cobden, at the time of the Mutiny, could not have anticipated what had since taken place; and if he were alive now, he would pro-

bably have retracted a great deal of what he then said. He could say, having been in India through the Mutiny himself, that he did not believe that what then took place had altered the feeling of the general mass of people towards the English nation. Cobden was afraid that the English would not be able to live in the country. But he (the speaker) believed that the Mutiny was simply a military mutiny, taken up by the loose portion of the population, whom they called *budmashes*; but that at and from that time the heart of the great mass of the people had been sound and loyal towards the British Government, no one who had lived in India could doubt. As time progressed, he had himself no doubt that heart would beat still more loyally towards the British Empire.

Mr. ROBERT H. ELLIOT said he might be suffered one word by way of explanation. In speaking of Indian land becoming exhausted, he did not deny the fact that there might be some tracts of a nature which made them practically inexhaustible. That applied, however, to, comparatively, a limited portion of India. There were many vast regions in the south, and in the north also, where the soils are, by comparison, poor; and whether originally so or not, the practice adopted of taking everything out of it without anything like an adequate replacement of manure, must inevitably end in exhaustion. Having the support of practical agriculturists in the deductions he had made, he had no doubt in the validity of what he had said.

Mr. A. ARATHOON said he thought the subject of the financial condition of India one more or less connected with the political exigencies of that country. In England, as well as in India, political exigencies and changes caused immediate depression of trade; and if this was the case in England, how much more powerful must the feeling be in a country like India, which had been the butt of rulers for their own personal aggrandizement! India wants stability of government to give security to those who have money to invest in great works, and this was a point of far more importance than the mere £ s. d. she was obliged to spend annually: He (Mr. Arathoon) could not help thinking that the gentleman who had furnished the paper had taken too hopeful a view of the present condition of finance in India. While it might be satisfactory, was it such that it could not possibly be better? As had been pointed out by Mr. Elliot, India's main source of income was from opium. That speaker had expressed his fears, but another speaker had urged that such fears were unnecessary, and that the Chinese would have the opium; even it

they had to smuggle it into the country. But he (Mr. Arathoon) thought it was admitted by all who had taken Indian finance into consideration that the opium duty was demanded by the exigencies of Indian finance, and if not, it would be removed, for it was regarded by many politicians as an immoral thing. Nothing but expediency, then, induced England to keep on such a duty, and thus to obtain a revenue which, when closely regarded, could not tend to its honour. Finally, Mr. Arathoon expressed his concurrence with the remark that, speaking generally, the revenue derived from India was of an inelastic kind.

The noble CHAIRMAN said the thanks of the Association were justly due to Mr. Pirie Duff for his very valuable paper, although he thought it was unfortunate that a misleading title had been given to it. The title of "Indian Trade and Finance" doubtless induced the belief that the subject would be a very dry one, and this had probably operated against the attendance at the meeting. It should have been called "A Reply to Mr. John Morley, or to the Manchester School," for that comprised the greater portion of the paper. Mr. John Morley appeared in this matter to have done Mr. Cobden very much the same harm which other biographers had done to the subjects of their biographies. Mr. Morley had written of the increased number of persons "who cannot see advantage either to the Natives or their foreign masters in this vast possession." Mr. Pirie Duff had confined himself to the finance and trade of India, and had not touched upon the other advantages to England in the possession of India. Without India, there is no doubt that this country would be only a second or third rate Power in the world. With regard to the advantages to the people of India in our possession of it, the fact of our existence in India was a proof of its advantage to the Natives, for on the day that the Indian people ceased to find it to be an advantage we should be driven out. We are there now supported by a comparatively small number of British troops, and this shows that our rule is looked upon by the people of India as a benefit to them. Mr. Pirie Duff might have dwelt a little more upon the defects of the Manchester School, as illustrated by Mr. Cobden, where he says, as an excuse for not discussing the details of Indian management, that he looks on our rule "with an eye of despair," and goes on to make this significant confession: "From an abiding conviction in my mind that we have entered upon an impossible and hopeless career in India, I can never bring my mind to take an interest in the details of its government." Mr. Cobden, moreover, said that in India "we play the part of despot and butcher." The latter charge could not be

sustained except during the time of the Mutiny; and this unwillingness of Mr. Cobden and the Manchester School to take an interest in the details of Indian government had much to answer for with respect to any despotic faults of the Indian administration. Mr. Cobden's statement, that we should get as much trade with India if it were not in our possession, might be compared with the act of the Manchester School in insisting upon the repeal of the import duties upon their cotton goods, in preference to a relief of the Indian population from the salt-tax, so injurious to the health of man and beast—an act, too, which, as they were recently told, was likely to have the effect of shutting up the Bombay mills and destroying a native industry.

General Sir ORFEUR CAVENAGH, K.C.S.I., proposed a vote of thanks to the Chairman, observing that Lord Stanley for several years past—indeed, from the very commencement of the Association—had taken a lively interest in its welfare. Many years ago his lordship visited the East, and made himself thoroughly acquainted with the people, mixing with them as few Europeans had ever done, and thus obtaining their confidence. The feeling of sympathy thus excited led Lord Stanley on his return to take an interest in Indian affairs in Parliament, as well as in the proceedings of that Association; and his presence on that occasion, together with the words he had addressed to them, was sufficient evidence that that interest was in no way relaxed, and that his sympathies were still elicited by any movement connected with the welfare of the people of India. (Hear, hear.)

MIRZA PEER BUKHSH seconded the motion, saying that he felt Lord Stanley was a thorough friend of the Indian people, and one who was always prepared to take their part when any injustice was offered them.

The motion was unanimously carried, and briefly acknowledged by Lord STANLEY, and the proceedings closed.

The following explanation from Mr. W. Pirie Duff was sent to the Secretary for publication.

N.B.—Had the state of my health, and particularly of my voice, admitted of my remaining to the close of the discussion on the 31st May, it would have been my pleasing duty to have seconded General Cavenagh's vote of thanks to Lord Stanley of Alderley for his kindness in presiding. I would particularly have expressed my warm personal acknowledgments to the noble Lord for his kindness to me in the matter, as I should also have done to Mr. Pirie Gordon, who,

when my voice failed me, most readily came to my help, and read the paper for me. I wish now to note one or two points in the discussion. Mr. Elliot's views in regard to future famines have been anticipated in the body of my paper. In regard to the more serious reflection he has passed on the possible exhaustion of the Indian soil, I am sorry I cannot speak from personal knowledge. Mr. Elliot speaks with the authority of an expert, and his opinion is entitled to great weight. He certainly does not exaggerate the importance of the subject, and it is to be hoped the Government of India will persistently endeavour to encourage the fullest development of a more remunerative system of cultivation of the land than is at present found in almost every part of India. Mr. Martin Wood was somewhat unfortunate in the remark he made, that, in combating Mr. Cobden's views, I had set myself "to slay the slain." Had Mr. Wood done me the justice to have read my paper beforehand, or to have listened to it when read by Mr. Pirie Gordon, he would have seen I emphasized the remark that Mr. Cobden's views were peculiarly dangerous, not because they were held by Mr. Cobden in 1857, but because they have been reproduced, a quarter of a century later, with the imprimatur of one of the most powerful of living English writers, Mr. John Morley. Mr. Wood is quite at liberty to retain his own opinion; I equally claim for myself the same liberty; and I cannot reckon it at all "superfluous" to endeavour to meet in argument, especially when I appeal to facts, so doughty a champion as Mr. Morley. I cordially sympathize with the sentiments of Mirza Peer Bukhsh; and it is because I believe the great majority of English officers—civil and military—in India are eager and anxious to "do justice and to love mercy" in their great work of administering so vast an empire, that I ask for them, at the hands of their countrymen at home, a loyal and generous sympathy and support. Mr. Rogers, in his able and temperate remarks, so completely answered the fanfaronade of Mr. Dadysett, that I may be excused referring farther to the latter speaker. In conclusion, I have only to add, how sensible I am of the kind consideration I met with from nearly all who took part in the discussion, and my great regret that, owing to an acute attack of bronchitis (which compelled me to go abroad immediately after the reading of the paper), I was quite unable to do that justice to my subject which the members of the Association were entitled to look for. The paper is now completed, but it has been judged undesirable to publish, meanwhile, more than was actually read, which was a mere section of what I had prepared, and was submitted to the meeting only because of its being complete in itself. On another occasion I

may have the pleasure of reading my remarks on the present state of Indian trade and finance, and the prospects of both in the future.

W. P. D.

Oakfield Lodge,

Denmark Hill,

July 20, 1882.

An Englishman in India.

PAPER BY E. J. KHORY, Esq., BARRISTER-AT-LAW,

READ AT A MEETING HELD IN DOUGHTY HALL, 14, BEDFORD ROW,
ON MONDAY AFTERNOON, JUNE 26TH, 1882.

SIR RICHARD TEMPLE, BART., G.C.S.I., PRESIDENT OF THE
ASSOCIATION, IN THE CHAIR.

A MEETING of the members of the East India Association, and others interested in the affairs of India, was held in Doughty Hall, in the rear of the Association's Chambers, 14, Bedford Row, on Monday afternoon, June 26th, 1882, the occasion being the delivery of an address by E. J. Khory, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, on "An Englishman in India."

SIR RICHARD TEMPLE, Bart., G.C.S.I., President of the Association, occupied the chair: and amongst those present were the following: Sir Henry Ricketts, K.C.S.I.; the Dowager Lady Havelock; Major-General G. Burn; Major-General R. W. Lowry, C.B.; Colonel R. M. Macdonald; Captain W. W. Ross; Mr. Edward B. Eastwick, C.B., and Mrs. Eastwick; Raja Rampal Singh; Rev. James Long; Dr. Vincent Ambler; Surgeon-General Balfour; Inspector-General of Hospitals Abraham Goodall; Dr. Pearson Nash; Mr. Abdul Ali; Mr. Hamid Ali; Mr. C. W. Arathoon; Mr. George Bain; Mr. C. N. Banerjee; Mr. and Mrs. J. W. Barnes; Mrs. Matthew Bloxam; Mr. S. B. Broacha; Mr. J. Algernon Brown; Mr. Neville Bruce; Mr. A. Chatterjea; Mr. C. J. Cooper; Miss Cooper; Mr. M. D. Dadysett; Mrs. A. Davey; Miss Davey; Mr. H. B. Doctor; Mr. A. A. Douglas; Miss Emily Eddes; Mr. George Elliott (Barrister-at-Law); Mr. and Mrs. G. L. Phipps Eyre; Miss Eyre; Miss B. Eyre; Miss M. Eyre; Mrs. M. Fischer; Miss Fothergill; Mr. H. W. Freeland; Mr. N. B. Gandevia; Mr. P. Pirie Gordon; Mr. H. A. Gray; Mr. James Greenwood (Barrister-at-Law); Mr. G. B. Havelock; Mr. Syed Mohammed Hassen; Mr. A. Hebron (Barrister-at-Law); Mr. James Heywood, F.R.S.; Mr. James Hutton; Mr. R. Jennings; Mr. J. B. Knight, C.I.E., and Mrs. Knight; Mr. J. G. Langley; Mr. C. A. Lawson (of Madras); Mr. C. R. Lindsay; Mr. M. Abdool Majid; Mr.

E. Garnet Man; Miss E. A. Manning; Mr. Francis Mathew; Mr. William McGuffin; Mr. J. N. Mitra; Mr. Narendra Nalla Mitra; Mrs. Orr; Miss Palmer; Mr. A. H. Pradhan; Mr. M. Rafique; Miss Rawlins; Mr. A. R. Scoble, Q.C.; Mr. A. K. Sethua; Mr. John Shaw (Madras); Mr. Shivanath Sinha; Mrs. John Stevens; Mr. George Temple; Mr. H. Thompson; Mr. William Trant; Mr. Hamed Ullah; Mrs. Whitworth; Mr. W. Martin Wood; Miss Worthington; Mr. W. Hamilton Burn (Secretary).

The PRESIDENT, in opening the proceedings, said he would at once proceed to business by calling upon Mr. E. J. Khory to read a paper on a subject of which due notice had been given—viz., “An Englishman in India.” He was sure that, in hearing this title, the meeting would be reminded of the old dictum that it is well that we should see ourselves as others see us. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. E. J. KHORY then delivered the following address:—

Sir Richard Temple, Ladies and Gentlemen,—An Englishman in India is an object of peculiar interest, and the subject of unceasing comment. Dread and affection, indignation and admiration, hatred and attraction alternately centre in him. His fair skin, his dignified appearance, his penetrating glance, and, above all, his tenacity of purpose, all go to make him a most conspicuous figure. The task of depicting the prominent features in his character as displayed by him in his military and civil capacities, and in his business and social relations, is too arduous a one to be properly done justice to. However, the picture attempted to be drawn in this paper will perhaps serve our present purpose, and will be applicable to an Englishman all over India. We first propose to review the career of an Englishman in his military capacity. When dressed fully in his scarlet martial attire, with all its golden and silver accompaniments, when armed cap-à-pie in the splendour of his glittering weapons, and when adorned and embellished with the noble badges of honours won and victories achieved, he appears a denizen of some better land to an Indian eye. A military organization worked on scientific principles, frequent display of warlike pomp, strict military discipline, and grand reviews of fine-sized English soldiers bring conviction home to an ignorant Indian mind that there is not a single nation on the surface of the earth which could cope with the English soldiers in military prowess. The superiority of an English soldier over an equally well-disciplined Native one in strength, stature, energy, pluck, and agility is invariably acknowledged. To an English

soldier, then, the vast and diverse communities, different in race and religion, many of which have no bone lost between them, alternately look up for support and safety. An instance in point happened at the late Mooltan riots between Hindus and Mahomedans, when soldiers of neither community could be employed without danger. To the Native mind, an English soldier is a compound of a lamb and a bull-dog. He is mild in manners, childlike in simplicity, and amenable to reason when sober. But when intoxicated, no bull, however ferocious, is more unmanageable. Like chaff before a gust of wind, a host of terror-stricken Natives fly before him. The Native police, redoubtable in the cases of Natives, take pretty good care to make themselves scarce at the sight of an English warrior running amuck. If our valiant devotee to Bacchus happen, by accident or for frolic, to enter a street inhabited by the effete races of the South, the doors of the houses, which are always left open during the day, are closed in his face, and the street of bustle is turned into a scene of dead silence, where our hero roams wild and alone. But his drunken pranks are received differently by the proud and hardy warrior races of the North. Blow is returned for blow, and sometimes these mad holiday pranks end in scenes of bloodshed. Fortunately, such occurrences are rare, and kept by officers under strong curb. An English warrior in command presents two different phases of character. One is very commendable, while the other is deserving of censure. He is wise by experience, tempered by age, and tamed by hardships in his boisterous career. He thoroughly understands the means and appliances which help to keep intact the rule of his great nation over people alien in manners, customs, religion, and sympathy. He well grasps the aims and purposes of his employers. He knows well how to preserve a vast country from danger, and how to keep its varied population in peace and harmony. Hence his treatment follows his diagnosis. He tries his best to attach the soldiers under his command to their English rulers, and to create regard and respect for the government under which they serve. Invariably, the Native soldiers are fond of their superior officers, like faithful dogs. But the cry is now and then against an upstart subordinate military officer. He is young, he is imperious, he is conceited. He is, unfortunately, ignorant of the people, their nature and their feelings. His mouth is very often teeming with unpleasant expressions. It is on his lips that the word "nigger" is uppermost. It is he who, when riding in a high dogcart, sweeps the crowds on either side with a long whip, to give his horse an unimpeded career. A mild Hindu grumbles, a fanatic Mahomedan looks indignant at this treatment, and in rare instances some take the retaliating law in their own hands, while others

invoke the assistance of the law; but it no less leaves a festering sore behind. Happily, the superior officers always lend a ready ear to complaints of this kind from the party aggrieved, and do adequate justice. Many of these subordinate officers live from hand to mouth. The billiard-room, the race-course, and the rich living soon drain their scanty purses; they often incur heavy debts. Some, thus running a desperate race in life, bring themselves into pecuniary straits. To avoid the pressing demands of their creditors, who are Natives, and to escape the rigour of the law, they have sometimes to leave the country *incognito* and in disgrace. But the instances of the kind are rare, and are often the offsprings of idleness and *ennui*. Military officers in higher ranks are not more remarkable for their high soldierly qualities than their adaptability to high civil, diplomatic, and administrative appointments. Sir Thomas Munro and Lord Napier, for instance, have filled the very responsible posts of Governors, and have ably administered large provinces under their rule. Colonel G. B. Malleson had been entrusted with the discharge of onerous duties in a Native State, and Colonel R. M. Macdonald was very creditably spoken of as administering with ability and dexterity a large public educational department.

We now turn to the second head of our subject—an Englishman in his civil capacity. The Civilians may be taken as the fulcrum on which the lever of the British Government in India moves. Civil Servants fill the posts from Sub-assistant Collectors and Assistant Magistrates to Judges of the High Court, and Governors of large provinces and presidencies. At the top of all the Civilians presides the Governor-General. Fancy his authority, and the extent to which that authority is directed! He is exactly in the position of a great potentate, sitting in one of the capital cities of one of the great countries of Europe, and sending his orders to other countries of the Continent. Who is, then, fit to occupy such a high position? He must be a man of vast political experience, extreme foresight, mature judgment, and intellect of a very high order. One hasty stroke of his pen against the interest of the subject-races will be disastrous to the strength and stability of the empire; one serious political blunder will be likely to launch him into an expensive and hazardous war with some border nation—a war not very easy to end, and not dignified to retreat without injuring the prestige of the English rule. Looking at the great responsibilities they are under, they are not paid very highly. They are rare and very valuable commodities, in the shape of talents, experience, and judgment, in the political market. Many political economists and the so-called Indian patriots are for abolishing this high office altogether,

and putting the Governors of the different Presidencies in immediate communication with the Secretary of State for India. The effect of such a change, if ever attempted, would be to split the Indian Empire into three or four kingdoms, and make the ruler of each responsible, instead of one head. Moreover, the greater part of the subject races, which look up to the Governor-General as the great Empress, whose nods are commands, whose words are laws, and whose presence in India is justice, would hardly reconcile itself to such a change. Leaving historians to paint in dull or vivid colours the conduct and deeds of men like Lord Bentinck, Lord Canning, and Lord Lawrence, we know enough of them to justify our remarks that they were persons most deserving to occupy the high post, and they did an amount of good to India. In the course of the last twenty years, the names of Lord Mayo, Lord Northbrook, Lord Lytton, and Lord Ripon have attracted our attention. No Viceroy was more beloved and respected for his eminent qualities of the heart and head, for the energy, impartiality, and devotedness with which he discharged his arduous duties, and no Governor-General was more lamented, and his noble family more sympathized with after his assassination, than Lord Mayo. Again, as a distinguished financier, and as one who exerted his best, and did eminent services to India by relieving thousands of people from the jaws of death at the time of the Bengal famine, we cannot but honour and admire Lord Northbrook. What is more gratifying and cheering than to hear, now-a-days, from time to time, from India, of the meritorious and praiseworthy acts of justice done by the present benevolent and kind-hearted Viceroy, Lord Ripon, full of admirable catholic virtues? How can benighted India afford to lose the lustre of such brilliant stars? The Lieutenant-Governors and the Governors engage our next attention. Subordinate to the Viceroy in authority, and in some respects controlled by him, they are independent in their own provinces, and often display superior qualifications and knack for governing subject races. Some of these men have been and are extremely popular with the people, by their constant hard work for the good of their subjects. Others, like Indian Nabobs, pass their days and months in the salubrious and lilly climes, leaving the administrative and tiresome part of the work to their councillors, in whose hands they play like dolls. Such men hardly force a word of applause from the mouth of the people when they leave India. Among the Lieutenant-Governors whose names are mentioned with fondness, esteem, and respect, the most prominent are Sir William Muir, Sir George Campbell, and Sir Ashley Eden. Sir Charles Trevelyan's name was on the tip of everybody's tongue all over India, although

he was the Governor of the Madras Presidency only. And why? Because, with a spirit of independence, he boldly pointed out the defects of the English administration in India; because he persuaded, advised, and almost led others by his good example how to treat the subject race; because he tried by every good act to endear himself to a large portion of the people of India who had the good fortune to be governed by him. In the Bombay Presidency, the names of the Governors that everybody is most familiar with are those of Sir Bartle Frere, Sir Seymour Fitzgerald, Sir Richard Temple, and Sir James Fergusson. Like Lord Ripon as Viceroy, Sir James Fergusson, as Governor, is on his trial, and he has within a short space of time so deservedly earned the reputation of a kind and able administrator, that by the time he leaves Bombay he will be as popular as some of his renowned predecessors. Sir Seymour Fitzgerald was a very courteous and well-disposed Governor, and it was quite a treat to hear his able and eloquent speeches on public occasions. As a matter of fact, we are obliged to give precedence to Sir Bartle Frere and Sir Richard Temple. Both of them were many years in India; both rose, step by step, to their high position; both had ample opportunities of becoming familiar with the habits, customs, prejudices, and feelings of the people inhabiting different parts of India. They were, like two experienced navigators, able to avoid shoals and quicksands, and to sail very successfully through storms and whirlwinds. There was hardly any movement for public good, or any work of public utility, to which they did not lend their hearty co-operation. Always ready to do even-handed justice between one of a ruling and another of a subject race, and always accessible to the humblest of their subjects to hear their grievances, they combined in themselves the dignity and gracefulness of rulers with the kindness and gentleness of patrons. The name of Sir Richard Temple rang in everybody's ears before he was appointed to rule over the Bombay Presidency. His eminent services in Bengal and his giant-like efforts in the famine were highly appreciated by the Supreme Government, and gratefully acknowledged by the people in distress. As a ruler of the Bombay Presidency, he was considered ubiquitous. The maxim, *Mens sana cum corpore sano*, was never so forcibly realized as in his case.

Very often the failure or success of a ruler in India depends upon his councillors. These advisers have tolerably good experience of Indian matters, but they are not always free from bias and prejudice. A Viceroy or a Governor, if not thoroughly conversant with the affairs in India, has to shape his conduct according to the advice of his councillors. If the advisers are not intimately acquainted with the

wants, feelings, and opinions of those who are left under the rule of their presidents in Council, and if they are not personally interested in the welfare of the people of India, their acts of legislation carry with them disaffection and discord. The Native members of the Council have no particular influence over their presidents. They are always in a minority, and are expected to sit as puppets. As prudent, impartial, and independent advisers of the Viceroy and the Governors, the names of the Hon. Mr. Tucker, the Hon. Mr. Gibbs, the Hon. Mr. Rogers, the Hon. Mr. Hope, Sir Barrow Ellis, and Sir Arthur Hobhouse are prominent. Next to Councillors, the agents of the Viceroy form an important body. Their arduous duty is to try their best to cement the ties of friendship between the Native Princes and Chiefs and the English Government. They have to fish in troubled waters, and carry on intercourse, with great delicacy, tact, and consideration, with persons not possessed of English education, English refinement, and English culture. Among these Political Agents who have given both sides satisfaction in discharge of their very onerous duties, we can mention, for example, the well-known names of Sir Henry Daly, Colonel Barr, Mr. P. S. Melville, of Baroda, Mr. J. B. Peile, of Kattywar, and others. The Collectors occupy the next position to Governors of Presidencies. The area of the country under the rule of a collector is not small. His power seems unlimited, his acts are occasionally considered high-handed, and his decisions as a judge, although now and then not over-erudite and hasty, are strictly binding until reversed on appeal. Imperfect knowledge of the vernacular dialects, and of the just principles of law, often leads him to commit blunders in the administration of justice. But, fortunately, the people of India have acquired full confidence in the High Courts. A baffled plaintiff, a defeated defendant in the Court below, and a suspected felon, all look upon this high tribunal for even-handed justice. However, now and then we meet with an expression of opinion in several parts of India that those only who are appointed directly from England to act as Judges of the High Courts can administer impartial justice, that the independence of those appointed by the local Government is in a great measure taken away, for though their judgments are impartial and honest as between private suitors, yet the same could not be said of them when one of the party to the suit is Government. Such an opinion seems totally unfounded when we look at the integrity, ability, and independence, for instance, of Judges appointed by the Government of Bombay from time to time. Such men, by their long practice at the Indian bar, are much better informed of the different tenures of land, and of the habits and feelings of the people, than those coming out fresh from England.

The condition of the police in India ought not to escape our notice. As a rule, the police in every country is an obnoxious body. An efficient staff in this department is very useful in preserving order, detecting crimes, and suppressing notorious gangs of thieves and malefactors. Sometimes it is converted into a dreadful engine of oppression, injustice, torture, and terror. He who rules over this notorious department ought, therefore, to be a man of great ability, pluck, and experience. Unfortunately, the heads of such departments in India are not generally well fitted for their posts. They often lack coolness, judgment, and experience. They generally become odious by their ill-treatment of the Natives. They have no experience, or are too haughty to use it, in the management of Native crowds. They are generally wanting in that essential quality—*suaviter in modo*. The Native gentlemen whom without a cause they insult and even ill-treat, may be persons commanding great respect among their people, may be Government officials in high posts, perhaps higher than their own. English subordinates in this department soon follow the example of their headstrong leaders. Such treatment leaves bitter rancour behind quite in disproportion to the cause of it. With all these shortcomings, the English portion of the police has intuitive administrative faculties. In times of real danger, when the Native police proves itself quite incompetent to meet it, the presence of English police officers inspires confidence in the inhabitants.

The persons into whose immediate contact the young Indian comes are those Englishmen who have the conduct of the educational department in India. These are the men who teach the young ideas how to shoot. Let it be said to the credit of these gentlemen, that they always treat their pupils with kindness and consideration. With fond memory, many a young man looks back to his school and college days, where he received the blessings of an English education from men who had gone through splendid careers at the Oxford and Cambridge Universities. A large part of the young Natives of India has ever to acknowledge a debt of gratitude to their kind rulers for mental culture and moral training of a superior kind. Many rising young men in Bombay, with pride and exultation, pronounce the name of that very distinguished scholar, Sir Alexander Grant, Bart., who now fills the highly honoured chair of the Principal of the Edinburgh University. Bombay had been fortunate to secure his eminent services as a Professor and Principal of the Elphinstone College, and, lastly, as a Director of the Public Instruction of the Presidency. Under him, young men in Bombay first understood and mastered the sound principles of logic, and took an insight into the Baconian philosophy. After him, under a very painstaking and distinguished Oxonian, Mr. K. M. Chatfield,

who is now the Director of the Public Instruction, the Native students made a very favourable progress in Latin, logic, and the English tongue. The Elphinstone College now boasts of having such an able and learned man as Mr. W. Wordsworth. Many other equally eminent names can be cited as regards their services in different parts of India.

We now come to the much-talked-of class of Civilians. People in India find a great difference between a Civilian of days gone by and a Civilian of the present age. The former had the real interest of the people of India at heart; the latter is found more or less devoid of that interest. The former always showed an anxiety to be familiar with the habits, customs, feelings, opinion, and languages of the subject people; while the latter cares very little or not at all to follow in the footsteps of his worthy predecessors. Formerly, the communication between India and England being not so easy as it is now, on account of the facility offered by the overland routes, the then Civilian had no other alternative than making India his home for many years, and, consequently, was obliged to treat the people of India with kindness, indulgence, and familiarity; but the Civilian of the present day, while staying in India, always longs for his home, his friends at home, and his people. Under such circumstances, what sympathy and intimacy can the people of India expect from him? Of the present Civilians, the younger portion has made itself particularly odious. This part is composed of very young men who come out fresh from England, and hold somewhat responsible posts of magistrates and assistant magistrates. Stuffed with an amount of book learning, they are sadly wanting in the practical experience of the world. They are impetuous, haughty, and conceited. Their glaring defects are very often depicted in their true colours by many noble-minded Englishmen who often come across them and minutely watch their conduct. Dr. Birdwood, of the Indian Medical Service, and very well known in the Bombay Presidency, remarks as follows: "The British government in India rests absolutely on the personal character of the men of the Indian Services, and, above all, of the Civilians; and the contentment of India with our rule—as apart from and secondary to the security of our rule—depends mainly on the discipline, the sense of duty, obedience, order, responsibility, on the conscientiousness of members of the public services." "The Service will be recruited yearly by an increasing proportion of young men whose intellects have been enfeebled and destroyed by injudicious forcing, and who cannot be expected to have been humanized by association with men of culture, and to have been developed in the healthy society of large numbers of the best men of their own

“age and force of intellectual and moral character—pedants and charlatans, in whose hands the splendid patriarchate of India—the Indian Civil Service—must degenerate into a cruel, inefficient, and corrupt bureaucracy, into which, as I maintain, it is already beginning to degenerate before our eyes.” Lord Hobart, as Governor of Madras, about ten years ago, declared at a public gathering thus: “About the intercourse of our public service, and especially of the more subordinate members of it, with the Natives of this country, there still lingers that which is, of all things, the most senseless, the most groundless, and the most impolitic—a tone of superiority and contempt.”

Dr. G. W. Leitner, who was for many years Principal of the Government College, Lahore, says: “An improvement in the relations of the two races had been expected by the institution of the competitive Civil Service, but this expectation has not been fulfilled. The present Civilians who govern India as a great monopoly practically, if not intentionally, for the exploitation of their own body, and who so surround the Governor-General that truth cannot always reach him, are, as a rule, more inaccessible than the officers to whom the government of India was formerly committed. They go out there too young to be safely entrusted with power. . . . We should not send boys to rule over India, but men (lawyers, scientific men, &c.) who have known something of the difficulties of the struggle for existence in England, and who can appreciate the rights of their fellow-creatures beyond their evanescent recollection of theories learnt at school.” Now, only from the knowledge of several instances of abuse of authority by young Civilians, whose acts are condemned alike by the Natives and many Englishmen in power, the people of India ought not to be hasty in attributing to the administrative system the gross perversion and miscarriage of justice that occur, but to the individual caprice and haughtiness of some of this notorious class of young Civilians.

We now proceed to the third heading of our subject—Englishmen in their business relations with the people of India. In this class we can place merchants, traders, missionaries, medical men, and lawyers, &c. Of these the most kind-hearted, lenient, polite, and indulgent to the people of India are the missionaries. As they recognize no distinction of creed or caste, the Natives, though not taking kindly to their mission, have learnt to appreciate their good and noble nature. Those Natives of India who can hardly see any redeeming quality in the character and conduct of their rulers are heard to say that England can boast of some good men, and these good men are the missionaries.

The lawyers that come out to India to earn their living are found to be civil and gentle, and they are doubtless compelled to be so, unless they choose to starve by display of their temper. India has proved a luxuriant field for reaping plentiful harvests even to those who never held a single brief for months and even years together in England. Those members of the legal profession that return to England after some years with a splendid fortune are some of the leading men in the bar, and more particularly the Advocate-Generals. Mr. A. R. Scoble and Mr. J. D. Mayne, the late Advocate-Generals of Bombay and Madras, and Mr. Marriot, who at present leads the bar in Bombay, have, besides amassing a plethora of wealth, won by their sweet manners and consideration for their clients' feelings golden opinions of all those Native litigants who happened to come in their way. An Englishman in the medical profession is thought a great deal of by the Natives. In complicated cases, and when the patient is on the verge of death, when the skill of Native medical men can proceed no further, the extreme anxiety of a Native family is to send for an English doctor. His arrival is looked upon as that of some angel descending from above to revive or protect a life almost extinct. The family circle gathers round him, and with breathless silence watches him examining the dying patient. If he pronounces the case hopeful, they shower blessings on him; but if his opinion is adverse, they burst into tears.

The English merchants in India are very affable to come into contact with. Devoid of this quality, they are likely to fare worse. Night and day, they have to deal with Natives as merchants, traders, and brokers. Almost all English firms depend upon a wealthy and influential Native broker to supply them with capital, and advise them as to the stability of the people dealt with. Often English merchants act in partnership with Natives. The Native clerks of English merchants enjoy the happy privilege of being well paid and kindly treated. The majority of these English masters have won the esteem and even affection of their Native subordinates. Such conduct on the part of the English merchants is not without its due advantages. They enjoy a prosperous life as long as they are in India, and many of them retire with sufficient wealth to pass the rest of their life comfortably in England. It is interesting to watch the conduct of an English tradesman in India. He does not seem to care for Native customers. If at all he serves them, it is with a show of condescension on his part. Educated Natives are often vexed to find distinctions made in hotels, restaurants, and hair-cutting saloons between English and Native customers. Many narrow-minded

and vain-glorious European ladies and gentlemen deem it a contamination to deal with a Native trader. In order to put them off their guard, Native shopkeepers who deal in English goods have to assume English names and decorate the shops in English style.

The most useful occupation for an Englishman in India is that of a public journalist. In this line he can devote his time, energy, and intelligence both to the benefit of his country and for the good of India. No class is more sensitive than that of educated Natives. They have begun to understand the principles and policy of public journals. It is mostly through the medium, and by the agency of this class, that the views and conduct of the rulers are made known to the rest of the population in India. Instead of following the advantageous policy of moderation and impartiality, some English journals in India constantly depreciate the merits and maliciously expose the defects of the subject race. It is not difficult to picture the effect of conduct like the above displayed by such English public writers. The latent disaffection which made itself prominent in the painful massacre of 1857, the deep-rooted antipathy of the bigoted Moslems to the ruling race, the half-slumbering cancer of hidden jealousy eating the very heart's core of the aggrieved Hindu, the eagle eye of the intriguing Russian watching with avidity his tempting prey from beyond the cloud-topping hills of hardy Cabul, are perhaps less dangerous and far less detrimental to the interest of British India than the mischievous tendency always displayed by English journals of the above-mentioned stamp and character.

Social intercourse between the rulers and the ruled is an oft-repeated tale. However, it by no means loses its interest and importance. An Englishman, while acting in the several capacities we have mentioned above, may be familiar with a Native of India, yet if he happen ever to come across him in social circles he acts as a stranger to him. Much to the annoyance and dislike of their English guests, many good-hearted and prudent Governor-Generals and Governors invite Natives of rank and distinction to their breakfast-tables and State balls; but the complaint is, that they betray ridiculous ignorance of the rules and etiquette of society. Enjoying the privilege of attending State balls without the ladies of their families, they not only do not freely join in the entertainment, but stand like statues in the corners watching. It is true, that with the exception of very few educated Indian families, Englishmen in India will be unable to find the Natives and their families fit companions for them for a long time to come; but, then, they have a graceful duty to perform, and a patronizing part to play. They ought not to abandon the Natives to

their sad lot. Forbearance, kindness, and indulgence will make the Natives work in the right direction, in order to be able to adapt themselves to English manners and etiquette. Englishmen ought to root out the painful idea that they have to freely mingle in familiar intercourse with people under their rule. They ought always to keep in mind that they do not go to India to govern its people with a high hand, but to teach, reform, and enlighten the governed races. The Natives are sufficiently educated now to feel their own position. The aversion of Englishmen to mingle with the Natives attracts our attention more prominently in the interior of India than in capital cities. At Surat (a town about 100 miles from Bombay) the Natives are prevented from taking a drive on the road leading to the band-stand, which is set apart exclusively for the enjoyment of the Europeans. At Broach (a town near Surat) the Natives are debarred from taking advantage of the public pavilion erected on the banks of the Nerbudda river for the recreation of the English inhabitants. In principal cities it is an eyesore for educated Natives to find gymkhanas, public baths, clubs, sports, and pleasure-grounds set apart for the exclusive use of Englishmen. To add to their vexation, some fool of a rich Native goes and presents a splendid band, or contributes a handsome sum to the fund raised for providing for the varied pleasures and enjoyment of the English people. However, to do justice to our rulers, we must confess that they have always shown a disposition to hold out their hands in cordiality and friendliness to deserving Natives. The Parsees, a community distinct in itself, in religion, manners, customs, dress, and habits, from the rest of the people of India, always loyal to their rulers, and very much interested in their welfare, have from time to time met with kind treatment at the hands of their English rulers. English families meet on equal terms with several educated and enlightened Parsee families. Lately Englishmen holding high posts in different parts of India have taken a great liking to Parsee youths as good cricketers. They enter into competition with the Parsees for this national and very popular game; they treat the latter very civilly on the field, and after the sport is over, whatever may be its result, freely entertain them at their tables.

On several occasions attempts have been made by Englishmen, who either lived in some corner of India, or who knew almost nothing about India, to make the English people in England believe that Native ladies are not at all fit to bear company of English ladies. Such sweeping remarks are certainly unjustifiable. In fact, Native ladies have distinguished themselves in the battle-fields, in politics, in

public enterprise, and for the promotion of works of science and art. How can such women be unfit companions for English ladies? In the present generation Native ladies have reaped the benefits of English education and English refinement, have come as far as England, have written books in their own languages, and one or two have married educated Englishmen. Such women cannot be put down as undeserving the companionship of English ladies. But, fortunately, English ladies appreciate their Indian sisters better than English gentlemen. The most praiseworthy instances are Lady Lawrence, Lady Napier, Lady Ettick, Lady Hobart, Lady Hobhouse, Lady Frere, the late lamented Lady Fergusson, Mrs. Phear, Miss Baring, Miss Temple, and the late very widely-known Miss Carpenter.

While coming across the Hindus, English ladies and gentlemen do often express their dislike to, and even abhorrence at, a particular part of their dress. It is the reputed Hindu dhotee, a piece of cloth tied round his waist, extending as far as his ankle, and leaving his calves bare. Educated Hindus, when they go out, very wisely put on English trousers; but on a hot summer day a Hindu, no matter how refined his manners may be in public, moves about in his family in no other dress than his dhotee. It is no wonder, then, that an Englishman cannot reconcile himself to a sight like this. A few years ago, a young educated Hindu, holding a high Government post in Bombay, came out of his house with only this miserable piece of cloth on his body, and began to discuss the law with the Police Commissioner himself, who attempted to put a stop to the firing of crackers in the front garden of the house, contrary to Government orders. Dressed as he was in this delectable dhotee, the Police Commissioner took him either to be the servant of the family or some loafing, impertinent fellow, and at once caused him to be arrested. His estimable dhotee was declared to be the cause of his disgrace.

With reference to friendly intercourse between the rulers and the ruled, we can hardly find better sentiments, couched in effective words, than those expressed by the great Oriental scholar, Sir Monier Williams. He says: "Mutual sympathy is needed by two peoples of two widely different countries, thrown by the force of circumstances into intimate political associations, so separated from each other, as far as the east is from the west, by diversities of language, religion, customs, habits of thought, and social institutions. . . . They must learn mutual forbearance; they must consider one another, to provoke unto little acts of kindness (little abstinences and wise reticences); they must be charitable in judging of each other, in making allowance for each other's infirmities, in thinking no evil of each other,

“ in bearing, believing, hoping, and enduring all things. In a word, they must cultivate brotherly charity. Are, then, the people of England and people of India wanting in this excellent gift of mutual charity? Let Indians look into their own hearts and examine their own consciences. My business, as an Englishman, is to inquire particularly into our own shortcomings. The question is one which cannot be lightly set aside; for, if we are wanting in common charity—including, of course, in that term the exercise of kindly feelings towards the people committed to our rule—then it is clear that all our doings in India are nothing worth. We may make laws, administer justice, preach the Gospel, educate the people, lay down railroads, telegraphs, and telephones, develop the resources of the countries, tame and control the forces of nature for the public weal; nay, more—we may bestow all our goods to feed the famine-stricken poor; but our rule will not be rooted in the hearts of the people; our legislation will be as hollow as sounding brass, our preaching and teaching as unmeaning as the tinkling of a cymbal, our empire as insecure as a tower built on sand, which some great storm will suddenly sweep away.”

Now, in order to get an idea of the harsh and cruel treatment offered by Englishmen to the Natives of India, we can very advantageously refer to a valuable paper read, in 1874, under the auspices of the National Indian Association, by Mr. Nowroji Furdoonji, a distinguished member of the Parsee community, and very well known all over India. He remarks that “freedom of thought and action, perfect liberty, impartial justice, and equality of rights, irrespective of creed or race, have been guaranteed to all Her Majesty’s subjects in India; but those fundamental principles are often violated in the case of Natives of the soil, who are treated as a conquered and an inferior race by their British rulers. . . . It is a well-known fact that Natives are often treated with incivility, harshness, and even contempt and personal violence. They are frequently stigmatized as niggers, a nation of liars, perjurers, forgers, devoid of gratitude, trust, good nature, and every other virtue that adorns humanity.”

Words to the above effect once escaped from the lips of Sir M. Wells, sitting on the bench of the highest judicial tribunal at Calcutta. It is not uncommon that, on many occasions, the subject races are treated as if they are rude barbarians and inhuman savages. Mr. Nowroji goes on to say that, “so recently as two years ago, Mr. Cowan, Deputy Commissioner of Umballa, without investigation or trial, and without waiting for the sanction of superior authority, blew away from guns no less than forty-nine Natives of India

“ belonging to a race called Koorkhas, who had taken part in a
“ disturbance which occurred in a Native State in Upper India. He
“ committed this act of unjustifiable and extraordinary severity after
“ the disturbance had been suppressed, when there was no reasonable
“ apprehension of danger.” The Governor-General of India expressed
himself on the subject in language as follows: “ This illegal and
“ indiscriminate execution was a massacre for which there was no
“ excuse. It was not palliated by any public necessity, and was
“ characterized by incidents which give it a complexion of barbarity.”

Mr. Nowroji speaks of several cases in which, although the
prisoners and their counsel admitted the guilt, the European jury
had no scruple in acquitting them. A European, named White, who
was tried in the High Court of Bombay for shooting two Natives near
Sholapore, was acquitted by a jury composed exclusively of Europeans,
notwithstanding the confession of the prisoner, and notwithstanding
the crime was proved against him. In another case, one Mr. Bullock,
who was tried in the same High Court for shooting his butler, was
only convicted of the minor offence of assault, and was sentenced to a
fine of about Rs. 800 and four months' simple imprisonment. Again,
a European who was tried for shooting a Native while he was engaged
in extracting toddy-juice from a palm-tree, pleaded the ridiculous
excuse that he thought he was shooting a monkey. Notwithstanding
the generous propensity of the noble-minded English nation in de-
nouncing and suppressing slavery all over the civilized world, a sort
of slavery has been practised and countenanced in India by several
English officials. In the words of Mr. Nowroji: “ In the Bombay
“ Presidency, during the tour of the collector, assistant collector,
“ superintendent of police, or other Government officers in the
“ districts, the potters of the village are often forced not only to
“ supply earthen pots to the whole establishment, but are also
“ compelled to supply water, wash clothes, sweep the floor, prepare
“ lights, and perform other menial offices, without any remuneration.
“ The blacksmith and carpenter are often forced to work in the
“ officers' camp without pay; milk, butter, fowls, eggs, sheep, corn,
“ and other supplies are forcibly procured by policemen at a little
“ more than half-price. . . . “ In order to make up the number of
“ bullocks and carts required by the European officers, the sepoys or
“ policemen often unyoke and carry off bullocks actually employed in
“ irrigating or ploughing the fields, and thereby subject the poor
“ cultivators to heavy loss and damage.”

We can, on reliable authority, mention several instances of gross
insults and ill-treatment given to the Natives by their English rulers,

"A cantonment magistrate in Kattywar, finding a poor Native "sepooy washing his face at a well, horsewhipped him on the spot." In the Broad Exhibition of 1871, a Native member of the local Legislative Council and a Native magistrate were very grossly insulted after having been specially invited as guests. Not only this, but many other Native gentlemen were whipped and driven away. At a public concert in the Town Hall at Bombay, several Native gentlemen were forced to leave their reserved seats already occupied by them to make room for the European audience. A Hindu Civil servant and a Native medical practitioner, while travelling in a railway carriage, were compelled to vacate their seats for the use of an English military officer and his female companions. Men working under European masters, in indigo factories, and on tea and coffee plantations, and servants and grooms of headstrong Englishmen, are very often treated with heavy kicks and blows. Occasionally, deaths ensue from this summary punishment, and it is very amusing to find the mishaps attributed to the poor victims' diseased spleens. A well-known instance of this kind of treatment, as best illustrated in the case of Mr. Fuller, is, most likely, fresh in the minds of many. This gentleman was an English lawyer, practising in the North-west Provinces. He once in temper dealt his groom such a blow that death was the result. The coroner, the doctor, and the magistrate soon came to an agreement that death should be laid at the door of the diseased spleen of the murdered man. The High Court, taking a little more serious view of the event, imposed a small fine on the aggressor. This led to the publication of a scathing minute from the poet Viceroy, Lord Lytton, condemning the conduct of the magistrate and High Court. Consequent thereon, hue and cry was raised against the Viceroy, in which almost all Englishmen of high and low degree joined. No after-seductions could regain to the Viceroy the popularity that he lost with his countrymen on this occasion.

Some years ago, several Englishmen of rather a fanciful turn of mind took extreme dislike to native shoes. They would rather have bare feet put in English shoes than native shoes, even with socks and stockings. This was a source of very great annoyance and insult to many respectable Native gentlemen. In courts of justice and in public offices, the Natives, notwithstanding all their remonstrances, had to walk barefooted. Once a European head master of the Government High School at Surat compelled all the Native pupils to take off their shoes before entering their class-rooms. Fortunately, this shoe-mania is fast dying out. Again, this is somewhat a universal complaint—that, no matter what may be the rank and posi-

tion of Native gentlemen, they are made to stand waiting like servants—sometimes for hours—in the gardens or the verandahs, when they go to English officials' bungalows, either on a visit or for business. Somewhat of a similar nature are the grievances of Native Princes and Chiefs when they go on a return visit to a Governor or Governor-General on a public occasion. A striking change, as the change of colours in a chameleon, is very often perceived in the conduct and attitude of several Englishmen of the type of a haughty military officer or a conceited young Civilian, while travelling from India to England. Suppose, on a steamer starting from Bombay for England, there happen to be an Englishman of the above stamp and a Native of India as first-class passengers; the first symptoms the Englishman displays at the sight of his Native fellow-passenger are of annoyance, suppressed anger and marked aversion. He tries his best to keep himself aloof from this object of contagion. While walking side by side on the deck, sitting at the dinner-table, and wherever he comes across the Native, he attempts to take no notice of him. He plays the part admirably till the vessel arrives at Aden. From Aden to Suez, he struggles hard inwardly to get the better of his raging passion and revolting feelings, and tries to make the best of his bad lot, indicating often by the shrug of his shoulders that what cannot be cured must be endured. From Suez to Port Said, he casts many a condescending glance at the object of his aversion, and, occasionally passing by him, blurts out "Fine morning!" "Clear sky!" and some such self-introductory expressions. As soon as the steamer enters the Mediterranean Sea, the pure and invigorating European atmosphere cools the oppressive heat of the Red Sea and of the sultry Indian clime raging in his brain. Now the good spirit guarding the approaching angel land, gently whispers into his ears that this is the vicinity of the land of freedom and equality, and he will have to treat his Indian friend with all kindness and regard. Moved by this inspiration, he enters into familiar conversation with his Native friend, and now and then throws out hints to the effect that "we are good friends now, and let not my great nation know that I who boast myself one of them treated you so shabbily." The all-amazed Native companion passes the end of his interesting journey, half doubting whether all that is said by his metamorphosed English friend can prove true, and, to his delight, very soon he finds that it is so. As soon as he places his foot on the English shore, he sees himself placed in a land of surprise and bewilderment. Here he finds the very courteous and obliging manners of Englishmen and Englishwomen in full contrast to the blunt, uncivil, and arrogant attitude assumed by

many of the same race in India. Here he perceives, to his great delight, that through the medium of the National Indian Association and its kind, obliging, and painstaking secretary, Miss Manning, he is received with open arms in English families, and is treated with every consideration and kindness. Here, again, he observes that a valuable institution, like the East India Association, gives him every opportunity of expressing his views and opinions on any subject relating to the welfare of India with such an independence as he would hardly dream of in India. Every Native of India, then, ought to be ever grateful to these associations for the philanthropic and generous manner in which they take up the cause of oppressed India, and for the noble efforts they continually make for the reformation and regeneration of India.

Let us now take a hasty review of the incalculable benefits the Natives of India have, up to this time, derived from the stay of an Englishman in India. He has put a stop to the inhuman custom of Suttee, the horrible crime of infanticide, and the monstrous practice causing fanatic Hindu devotees to be crushed under the hideous car of Juggernaut. He has rooted out the Thugs, a band of hereditary robbers and murderers, and suppressed many other revolting barbarities. On the one hand, he has almost succeeded in driving away ignorance, the formidable enemy of India; and, on the other, he has spread the genuine rays of English education throughout the length and breadth of India. He has imprinted deep marks of good by the introduction of railways, telegraphs, steam power, the press, and the gaslight; by the construction of canals, and stately edifices; and by providing for many other comforts of life. His stay has chased away anarchy and despotism from India. He has made ignorance, indolence, and superstition slowly give way to education, energy, intellect, industry, and truth. He is patiently evolving the social and political regeneration of India. He has influenced his magnanimous people in England to show conspicuous proofs of their profound sympathy with the Natives of India, by voluntary subscriptions for the famine-stricken population, and by saving them, from time to time, from the very jaws of death. And what more? He has given the people of India the most estimable boon, in the shape of liberty of speech, petition, and the press, which was in danger of being for ever snatched away, but which has been, fortunately, lately restored by a wise act of the present good-hearted Viceroy. A very able paper, some time ago read by Sir R. Temple, in connection with the National Indian Association, gives a detailed account of the innumerable advantages India has up to the present moment derived from the English rule. We cannot do better than refer to the paper on the subject. But England does not stand without her compensation. She alone, among the great countries of

Europe, enjoys the high fame of ruling over a country almost as large as Europe. India contributes as much as 18,000,000*l.* in cash to the resources of England, and takes 82 per cent. of her whole imports from England. India, moreover, supplies the pay of 70,000 British officers and soldiers.

Notwithstanding the many advantages we have enumerated above, the Natives of India are found constantly grumbling about the English rule. They are clamouring for self-government—a demand, let us hope, which will be acceded to so far as it is the outcome of intelligent public opinion, and a thorough appreciation of British rule. Many self-constituted Indian patriots always come forward, raising an uproar that Englishmen have nothing to do with India, and the people ought to be left alone to rule over their own country. But, in the memorable words of Sir Arthur Hobhouse, “if India were a nation, we should have no “business there, and it is impossible to suppose we should have got “there as rulers. But because it was a congeries of tribes, religions, “and castes—some bitterly hostile, others bitter and contemptuous “to one another—it had fallen under the rule of paramount power, “strong enough to subdue all rivals to subjection, and to keep the “peace.” When such is the state of affairs in India, how can the people expect to rule the country? They must show themselves deserving, in every respect, of self-rule before they desire it. There is not the least doubt that if Englishmen were to leave India to-day in the charge of its people, to-morrow would be conspicuous for the reign of confusion, anarchy, and bloodshed all over India; the third day would give an easy opportunity to some foreign tyrant who might have been for a long time greedily watching to pounce upon his prey; and in a very short time the people of India would rue the day when they wished to be left alone with the reins of self-government. However, it is a matter of extreme gratification to find that, notwithstanding all clamours for self-government and cries for the redress of many imaginary grievances, a greater part of the educated, intelligent, and sensible population of India has already begun to perceive in England, not the money-grubber, not the blood-sucker, not the tyrant, but the nourisher, the protector, and, above all, the benefactor. The people of India are often blessed with many a high-minded and noble-spirited Englishman as their ruler, and whom, with joy and gratitude, they are often found addressing: “Still in thy right hand carry gentle “peace: be just, and fear not; and let all the ends thou aimest at be “thy glorious country’s, thy God’s, and Truth’s.”

Mr. S. BURJORJEE BROACHA said he had listened with the

greatest possible interest to the able address which had been delivered by Mr. Khory. It had struck him, while Mr. Khory was speaking, that he was under two conflicting influences in expressing his convictions. He could not help contrasting the kind and courteous and considerate treatment the Natives of India meet with at the hands of Englishmen at home with the behaviour of a contrary sort manifested by the Englishmen in India. Mr. Khory never dwelt upon the faults of Englishmen in India without a sense of hesitation, and a marshalling of traits of a redeeming character. The result was a sort of compromise. There was neither unstinted praise nor unqualified blame, but a sort of medley of light and shade, which probably would serve the object better, since it would be more congenial to the people of this country. For himself, he would own an admiration of the British Civil and Military Services in India as the greatest which the world had ever seen, and they had grown with the growth and extended with the extension of the British Empire in the East. But while he yielded to none in his admiration of the Services as a body, it was not the less his conviction that the majority of Englishmen in India, however just and impartial they were collectively, were not just or impartial as individuals. (Hear, hear.) However just and impartial they were as between Natives and Natives, they were not equally regardful as between Natives and Englishmen. ("Hear, hear," and dissent.) What he was saying he knew that most of his countrymen felt, although few dare express their opinion, and fewer Englishmen would like to hear it. There is a feeling among Natives, almost amounting to a conviction, that the beginning of Lord Lytton's unpopularity with his countrymen in India was in his lordship's issue of the celebrated Fuller Minute. (No!) In avowing this opinion, he spoke not as one censuring the English people, for he readily conceded that no other conquering race exerted their power with, on the whole, such good intentions. He could place himself in the Englishman's position, and ask himself what he should have done in like case, and his conscience told him that he would probably have done a great deal worse. It was a fact that, however pretty cosmopolitanism and universal philanthropy might in be the abstract, blood must prove thicker than water, race instincts must exert influence, and national prejudices hold some sway. And it was a sort of conviction with him that the majority of Englishmen in India were unsympathetic, ungenial in spirit, arrogant, and contemptuous to the subject populations of India. (No!) He repeated, that he did not blame them for this, for these qualities were perhaps needful to the consolidation of empire over the 200,000,000 of India by a mere handful of English-

men 10,000 miles from their base of operations. Until victory was secured, the sterner qualities of human nature were a necessity to the existence of Englishmen in India. (Hear, hear.) But the qualities which were necessary then for the march to empire are not the qualities which are needful to continue and maintain it, and to reconcile the conquerors and the conquered. (Hear, hear.) The policy of the elder time should be completely reversed. It is now for Englishmen to show that they have that nobility and many-sidedness which some of their foreign critics have denied them; it is for them to show that they are as pre-eminent in the qualities needful for the reconciliation and contentment of the subject people as they were in the qualities required to conquer them; to show themselves possessed of the generous and assimilating spirit of the Romans—a spirit which procured the maintenance of the empire by provincials long after the Italians had abandoned the profession of arms. Englishmen conquered India from some of the worst despotisms which have ever disgraced the pages of history, and relieved the peoples from grinding tyranny. The first generation had the contrast between the two forms of government presented to their own personal experience. They knew both. The second generation had the memory and the traditions of the old evil times; communication with the West was scanty, and very restricted; they were not much affected by any abstract notions of liberty. But now, in the third generation, the times have changed. The present generation of Indians have not the experience of the first generation, nor the memory and tradition of the second; but born and brought up under the ægis of the British rule, the old despotism and anarchy are not even names. Highly trained instructors from the universities of England have taught them; and every Indian schoolboy knows the history of England, has learnt for what Hampden fought and Sydney died, and in the noble story of the long struggle for constitutional liberty in England, has learnt the dignity and freedom of man, and the justice and efficacy of government of the people by the people for the people. (Hear, hear.) There is, too, an increasing influx of young Indians into this country who carry back to their own land the notions of liberty and freedom, and the sense of equality which is begotten of frequently successful rivalry with English competitors. Communication with the civilization, energy, and thought of the West is no longer scanty, as a generation ago; railways, telegraphs, newspapers permeate the masses of Indian society, and Eastern and Western influences are in constant reciprocal action. Under these circumstances, Englishmen must

not be surprised, much less angry, if they hear Native speakers ask for greater sympathy, greater liberty, greater equality, and, more than all, greater considerateness for their feelings and sensibilities. (Hear, hear.) It is nonsense to tell them to be content, because their fathers were content; they might as well have addressed that argument to Englishmen before the days of the Reform Bill, or in the remoter times when they were serfs; in which case Englishmen would have remained serfs to this day as their fathers were. Rather than thwart such a movement as this, it should be the duty of Englishmen to encourage it, and direct and control it; and in Lord Ripon's recent Minute he thought he saw the dawn of better days of deeper sympathy with, and greater consideration for, the feelings and aspirations of the millions of India. (Hear, hear.)

RAJAH RAMPAL SINGH said that before he proceeded to make a few observations on the subject of the paper he had to congratulate the gentleman who had taken the pains to produce it on the success which he had achieved in the direction of bringing to the notice of Englishmen the grievances of Indians under the present condition of government. There were one or two points in the paper upon which he (the speaker) would offer a few remarks. The first point he had marked was an allusion to soldiers, and as he claimed to be a soldier, they might consider that he was partial. The lecturer had said: "The superiority of an English soldier over an equally well-disciplined Native one in strength, stature, energy, pluck, and agility, is universally acknowledged." He (the speaker) did not agree that this was universally acknowledged. On many occasions Indian soldiers had shown themselves as brave as English, and had been equally praised. He remembered that on one occasion General Cavenagh delivered a lecture in connection with the Association, and he gave a very high character to Indian soldiers, and mentioned the circumstance that he owed his life on one occasion to an Indian soldier. He accordingly differed from Mr. Khory on the point. On another point reference had been made to the offices of Viceroy and Lieut.-Governor. That was a subject that had been well discussed, and many opinions had been expressed. There could be no doubt that these offices necessitated a heavy demand on the Indian Exchequer, and he thought it desirable that the office of Viceroy should be removed, or the others, and that a better Council should be formed of Indians, which would serve a very good and useful purpose. (Hear, hear.) The lecturer had made some reference to the power of the Council, and in connection with that, he (the speaker) called to mind a conversation with a Maharajah who

had just been elected on the Council. He said to him, "Maharajah, you don't know English; how will you express yourself?" The reply from the Maharajah was, that he knew very well he would have to agree with the Viceroy's party, and so he would lift up his hand when he saw the members of that party lift up their hands. An Indian member was only expected to lift up his hand, and not to express any opinion. They go to the Council, but they are over-numbered by the paid members of the Council; they only go and sit down, and do not understand a word of the business, and whatever should happen to be the intention of the Viceroy, it would be passed and approved. Then again, agents had very great power, and if necessary, he could call to mind many instances in proof of this. Reference had been made to officials not having a knowledge of Hindustani. That was quite true. He claimed to know his own language, which he had studied from his childhood, but he had not in his whole life met one European who could speak Hindustani correctly (Hear, hear.) If Englishmen want to govern India properly, they should know the language. Another point spoken of by the lecturer was that which was testified by Mr. Nowrojee as to the services demanded of the Natives when the collector was going on tour, and the deprivation of the Natives of their cattle, for which they got no payment. That, perhaps, was not so much the fault of the superintending officers as his retinue, but still it was a great injustice. In conclusion, the speaker said he entirely agreed with the lecturer, and corroborated his statements.

Mr. FRANCIS MATHEW (Bombay) said that, having spent the last five-and-twenty years in India, he had followed Mr. Khory's address with great interest, and especially that portion in which he passed under review the many men of whom England had just reason to be proud in connection with the administration of India. But he felt bound to say that Mr. Khory had totally misunderstood the spirit by which Europeans in India have been and are actuated. With perfect confidence, he could assert that Mr. Khory's allegations against the ruling race as a whole could not be supported, and his ascription of motives is totally foreign to their intentions and to their actions. Thus, to say that British gentlemen in India regard or speak of the Natives as "niggers" is an amazing assertion, and it is safe to say that any man guilty of such an expression would be regarded with disapproval and contempt by his fellow-countrymen. (Hear, hear.) The same remark applies to the alleged habit of maltreating the Natives. It is totally foreign to the ordinary

Englishman's habits and opinions, and no solitary instances to the contrary here and there would be offered as a national characteristic by any impartial observer. (Hear, hear.) The instances Mr. Khory had cited had been cited many times before; they form the stock-in-trade of a small band of pretended patriots. Mr. Khory had mentioned one highly respectable Native gentleman of Bombay, Mr. Nowrojee Furdoonjee, to whom he was indebted for a good many of his stories. Well, Mr. Nowrojee Furdoonjee was an excellent gentleman, with whom he (Mr. Mathew) served for years on the Corporation and Town Council of Bombay. Living on a pension from the Government now, he devotes a great deal of his time to public purposes, and is a useful citizen; but before all, he is an orator, and he indulges his talent and exhibits his independence by making free comments upon the ruling authorities; and the instances which Mr. Khory has cited are, for the most part, from Mr. Nowrojee Furdoonjee's repertory. The incident related regarding a certain public ball at Broach, for instance, occurred sixteen years ago. He (Mr. Mathew) was at this ball, and remembered the circumstances. A respectable Parsee gentleman was refused admittance, as the ball was intended for Europeans, and a Jewish gentleman, whose liberal hospitality had been freely enjoyed by Englishmen, was also turned away. But the sequel should also have been told. The occurrence was an action on the part of a very junior officer who misunderstood his instructions, and who suffered very severely by the losing his appointment. (Hear, hear.) Was this a grievance to be again and again repeated as giving any fair indication of the state of European feeling in India? (Hear, hear.) To take the case of Surat, where Mr. Khory says the Natives are prevented from taking a drive on the road leading to the bandstand, he (Mr. Mathew) could only say that he had been in Surat many scores of times, and knew many officers there, and he simply could not believe that the facts were as stated. (Hear, hear.) Why, the gardens were ornamented at the cost of Native gentlemen? Was it possible to conceive the civil power entering an action against any Native gentleman who chose to use the road? (Hear, hear.) And it must not be forgotten that in Surat there are many highly intelligent Native gentlemen. This was a grievance that he had never heard of before; he (Mr. Mathew) thought it incredible that it should have existed without his ever being cognizant of it. Sir Richard Temple, with whose presence they were to-day honoured, was lately Governor of Bombay, and the meeting might judge whether he would have tolerated such a grievance as had been described; and

he (Mr. Mathew) was equally sure that the present Governor of Bombay, Sir James Fergusson, would not for a moment permit such a slight being put by officials on Native gentlemen, as Mr. Khory had alleged. He (Mr. Mathew) would only further say that Mr. Theodore Hope, whose reputation was known here, was many years Collector of Surat, and he was confident that neither Mr. Hope nor his successors, with all of whom Mr. Mathew was acquainted, would have acted, or have permitted others under their authority to act, as described by Mr. Khory. In conclusion, Mr. Mathew observed that he had listened to the terminating passage of Mr. Khory's paper with satisfaction, for he there acknowledged the benefits India has derived, and is deriving, from the continuance of the connection with Great Britain. India is, indeed, increasing in wealth and prosperity from year to year, and has a yet brighter future in store for her; and, under Divine Providence, the social condition of her people appears to be likely to be cast in happiness, which will compare not unfavourably with that of any other large population in the world. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. JOHN SHAW said he thought it was a good thing to have such a paper read as that with which the Association had that day been favoured. It was good for those who fancied they had some knowledge of India to be shown themselves as other see them, as the President had suggested. It was also good for those who did not know India that such a paper should be read for the first time at a meeting of the Association at which discussion was invited and had already followed, in order that if there were any poison in the paper, the bane and antidote might go forth to the world together. (Hear, hear.) The author of the paper, in his opinion, could not be said to be a representative of the people of India—(hear, hear)—nor of any large section of the people. He belonged to a class which he (Mr. Shaw) believed and hoped—although that hope was not unmixed with fear—was largely increasing in numbers and importance. The influence of that class in India must be something altogether outside of and beyond their numbers, and the very existence of such a class must have an indirect influence throughout the whole length and breadth of India which is simply incalculable. It was, therefore, but right and proper that the Association should do what it could to make the views and aspirations of that class known as widely as possible, in order that they might be thoroughly understood, and, if necessary, should in some respects be combated. There were some things which he held were to be combated in the paper they had heard, and he would advert to one or two of the passages which he had marked. First of all, he

would allude to the title. It was somewhat misleading. He thought they were going to be told about some individual Englishman in India. It might possibly be a review of the career of their President, or perhaps an account of the benefits which an erratic M.P. had showered upon India during six weeks of the cold weather. Then as to some of the statements made. They were told about the Native police flying before a drunken European soldier. Now he had spent a good deal of his time on the second line beach in Madras, and though the drunken European soldier was not very prevalent about there, because, as Mr. Khory had truly said, "such occurrences are rare, and "kept by officers under strong curb," an equally formidable monster—the drunken European sailor—was common. No doubt the Native police kept out of the way of such men, but he believed that was, partly at all events, in obedience to an order that they were not to interfere in these cases, as it was particularly irritating to the drunken European to be tackled by the Native policeman. A troublesome man in charge of a European constable was often brought to his bearings by the threat, "I'll give you to the blacks." (Laughter.) He was speaking of Madras, the only part of India which he professed to know anything about; and he had to repudiate, on the part of the Natives of the South, the idea that they were to be regarded as an effete race of men. He thought them as plucky little men as are found anywhere. Passing by what had been said about the military subordinate officer and the singular selection of eminent soldiers, though that was a tempting subject, he came to a subject with which he was more familiar—viz., the administration of justice. With regard to the collectors having an imperfect knowledge of the just principles of law, he would remind the meeting that these gentlemen are not supposed to be learned lawyers, because their judicial business was simply that of magistrates, and, therefore, always under the immediate supervision of the High Court, to whom their proceedings have to be reported. He did not quite understand what was said about the judges. All judges of the High Courts are appointed directly from England, and only temporary vacancies are filled by the Indian authorities. Perhaps it was hardly his (the speaker's) place to speak of the police, or to defend the Civilian or competition-wallahs, the last of whom had, according to Mr. Khory, made themselves particularly obnoxious. With reference, however, to the quotations Mr. Khory had given from Dr. Birdwood and others, he made bold to say that the assertions were not true of the Madras Civil Service, and he did not believe they were true of any branch of the Civil Service. He had watched the competition-wallahs

very carefully, chiefly to see in what they differed from the old Haileybury men, but all the difference he had been able to make out was this—and it was a very material one—that there was an utter absence from the ranks of the new Service of the remarkably bad bargains who used occasionally to find their way into the old Service. That was the distinguishing mark that he found. Proceeding to comment on the paper, Mr. Shaw next picked out the words, “While lawyers are civil and gentle,” adding quickly, “I should not have thought it.” (Laughter.) He next remarked on the allusion to tradesmen, saying those cited did not belong to Madras. Then as to the journalists, they might speak for themselves. The first speaker had said something about the way in which the European looks down on the Native. He was not at all sure that the boot should not be put on the other leg. There are a good many Natives who look down with scorn and contempt on Europeans, and it was such who held aloof from European parties. They do not dine with Englishmen, of course, and an Englishman is always difficult to get on with unless you will dine with him. (Laughter.) In conclusion, he (Mr. Shaw) would speak of one part of the paper which he had read with some pain. He referred to the passage in which it was said, “It is very amusing to find the mishaps attributed to the poor ‘victims’ diseased spleens.” How it could be amusing to contemplate the death of a fellow-creature from violence he was at a loss to conceive. Nor was there anything amusing in the existence of diseased spleens, for he believed the prevalence of that disease among the lower classes of the servants of Englishmen in India was one of the greatest trials and dangers to which the English were exposed. Such an incident as this might easily happen. A young subaltern, in all the pride and glory of possessing a horse of his own for the first time, finds that it has been grossly neglected. The Syce, if not impudent or too drunk to get up, stands before him in that aggravating way with which Anglo-Indians would be familiar. The boy strikes a blow such as he has been accustomed to exchange with his schoolmates but a few months before without even an interruption of amicable relations, and he finds that it has become a question for a judge and jury to decide whether he is not guilty of murder. (Hear, hear.) He (Mr. Shaw) could not find much to be amused at in this, nor was there anything in such an episode at all improbable. (Hear, hear.) He was sorry the question had been again referred to of English dislike to native shoes. It was a foolish business, with faults on both sides, but the difficulty was chiefly due to the Natives, who would not suggest anything to take the place of this taking off of shoes, as a piece of ordinary

civility or politeness. He had omitted to refer to what had been said about Lord Lytton's interference, on behalf of the Natives of India, with a decision of the High Court. What was wrong in that was the interference of the Executive Government with the administration of justice. That was a thing against which Englishmen always had set themselves. They knew perfectly well such a case as that in question would only arise from apparently justifiable causes. But as the lawyers say, "Hard cases make bad law;" and if this interference with the High Court had been tolerated, it would have been a dangerous precedent, and Natives should be, and are, quite as much interested in preventing this interference as any Englishman. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. W. MARTIN WOOD, in the course of some brief criticisms on the tone and character of Mr. Khory's address, expressed his regret that it did not exhibit a better sense of proportion between its statement of facts and deductions, or sentimental generalisations, of which the paper so largely consisted. The insolence or high-handedness of a youthful subaltern officer lashing out right and left as he drives along the road, should surely not be set up as a picture of the British officer in India. There are a few foolish and reckless persons to be found in all classes, but such exceptions are not to be counted for the whole. That some such unpleasant incidents as Mr. Khory had cited had really occurred at one time or other, might be admitted; but his attempt to generalise from such cases had resulted in a distortion of the whole subject. Besides, several of Mr. Khory's general statements would not bear examination. What could be said of his assertion, that, "to avoid the pressing demands of their creditors, who are Natives "and to escape the rigour of law," military officers "have often to "leave the country *incognito*, and in disgrace"? This was in effect a monstrous mis-statement. (Hear, hear.) It was to be hoped that a few years hence, when Mr. Khory comes to look over this paper again, he will see these were the mistakes of inexperience, which a greater acquaintance with facts and a wider knowledge of affairs will have made him regret were ever given currency from his pen. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Mathew had very properly referred to the ancient and unrevised stories which Mr. Khory had extracted from the repertory of Mr. Nowrojee Furdoonjee. He (Mr. Wood) was second to none in appreciation of Mr. Nowrojee Furdoonjee's excellent qualities as a public man and a citizen, but it was perfectly well known that many of the incidents cited, which he collected many years ago, had been shown to be exaggerated or ill-founded. In any case, their repetition

was undesirable in any modern treatment of the subject. As regards Mr. Khory's statement, that at Broach Natives "are debarred from "taking advantage of the public pavilion on the banks of the Nerbudda," Mr. Alexander Rogers, a member of their Council, who knows Guzerat from end to end, had authorized him to express his regret that he was unable to attend the meeting in order to offer a categorical contradiction. Mr. Rogers says, there is no "public pavilion on the "banks of the Nerbudda," or, at least, he never heard of such erection ; there were only a few benches, which were subscribed for by the European residents themselves. As to the Surat story about the Natives being prevented from driving on the band-stand road, Mr. Rogers says, "it is entirely incorrect." With regard to the remarks in the paper on the contrast between the old Civil Servant and the competition-wallah, Mr. Wood remarked that he had known very many of both classes on the Bombay side, and some in other parts of India, and he had never been able to see the justice of such strictures as these on the new men. Young men, especially young men of intellectual ability, may exhibit a high sense of self-esteem, but in the business of life that speedily wears off. That they begin young, must be admitted ; but even that misfortune they soon overcome ; and, speaking of the new order of Civilians as a class, they need not fear comparisons of any fair kind. In conclusion, Mr. Wood said he did not wish to draw any invidious comparison, but must own to the opinion that the general effect of Mr. Khory's address contrasted very ill, for instance, with the judicious and considerate remarks which fell from the first speaker, Mr. Broacha. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. H. W. FREELAND said that, having listened attentively to the paper, he would venture to make a few remarks which had suggested themselves to him whilst it was being read. He did not think that any better plan could be adopted for promoting the bonds of unity and brotherhood between Indians and Englishmen than the bringing of representatives of each class together in meetings like the present. (Hear, hear.) As to the paper itself, as someone had already remarked, the writer had to some extent mixed up lights and shades. That was very well in one sense ; he should have been sorry to have listened to the reading of a paper giving lights alone, because every one listening would have felt that the object was to flatter the ruling power. (Hear, hear.) Well, shadows had been introduced ; they had been introduced, he might say, by an artistic, but he would rather say by a friendly hand. The reader of the paper had, among other things, spoken of the evil arising in India from the drunken

soldier, and another speaker had referred to the drunken sailor, with whom the police were not desirous of coming into contact. Well, all he (the speaker) had to say about drunkenness was this, that it was not an exclusively military vice. Formerly it was the sovereign vice in England, but the progress of public opinion had so far driven it out of good society, that in the clubs of London a drunken man would not be able to show himself. (Hear, hear.) Among officers both of the Army and the Navy the same spirit prevails. Indians, however, should know that they alone do not suffer from the annoyance of drunken sailors and soldiers; England had occasionally to put up with the same thing; and they could only trust to the progress of public opinion, combined with measures of a repressive nature, to counteract that vice. For his part, he would urge the dismissal or the long suspension of any soldier or sailor who, while wearing the uniform of Her Majesty, should be seen in a state of drunkenness, or offering violence either to a Native or European. (Hear, hear.) One of the speakers had remarked on the conduct of subordinate officers to the Natives, but such conduct could only come from an ignorant booby, who should be treated as such conduct was in England since duelling had been done away with—viz., with the silence of absolute contempt. He remembered that many years since Sir James Weir Hogg gave (he thought at Haileybury) some sound advice to young men as to the way in which they should conduct themselves towards the people of India; and he had often thought that Sir James's suggestions might be printed again and circulated, as they were extremely valuable and practical. One speaker had referred to Englishmen who, having got into debt with the Natives, took to flight. All he could say was that, as a member of the Executive Committee of the International Association for the Reform and Codification of the Law of Nations, one of the subjects engaging attention was to bring about such improvements in law as would facilitate the recovery, in one country, of a debt contracted in another. He hoped that the progress of legislation would secure this object, so as to protect, as far as possible, the Natives of India from Englishmen who misconduct themselves in this respect. Mr. Freeland next alluded to the difference which had been referred to between the conduct of Englishmen in England towards the Natives of India and their conduct towards the Indians in India, and said that if that were so, the more Indians came to England and mixed with Englishmen here, the more rapidly would a better state of things be produced in India between the governing and the governed races. As regarded the alleged

aversion of Englishmen to mingle with the Natives, he could only say that he had never found a trace of that feeling ; but if it existed, it was the result of prejudice, to be overcome by the progress of public opinion, as had been, to some extent, the case with the differences that used to exist in America between the white population and men of colour. The lecturer, among other things, had spoken of the administration of justice in India, and he (Mr. Freeland) was glad to note that he had paid a tribute to the judges, because the impartial administration of justice is more essential than anything else to the well-being of a country. He happened to have read a paper at Frankfort on the administration of justice, and on the mixed tribunals in Egypt, and he believed that the introduction of European judges there had proved of the greatest advantage to that country, and had inspired such confidence that Natives had been found to transfer their rights to Europeans in order to get the advantage of trials by the mixed tribunals. He believed the institution of mixed tribunals had been one of the best things ever introduced into Egypt. Reverting again to Indian matters, the speaker said that some remarks had been made about the qualities which now ought to be brought into play on the part of Englishmen. He fully sympathized with the Indians on that point. There was no doubt that in the olden days, when an Englishman had to regard his location in India as somewhat permanent, he would naturally cultivate more friendly relations with the Natives than was said to be the case at present. He hoped, however, that Englishmen would still devote themselves earnestly to the gentler duties—objects of peace and conciliation ; and that consistently with the spread of a pure system of justice. The obligations in regard to education, and especially female education, should be well weighed and fulfilled. The future of every country depended on this ; and more particularly was it to be desired in a country like India, that the women, the mothers of the coming generation, should be educated for the duties which they had to fulfil. We must look, under God's providence, to education as a thing that will lead the women of India to bring up their children with a love of justice, and in a spirit of affectionate loyalty to that great empire of which they, with Englishmen, were brothers born and subjects. One word more. One gentleman had alluded to what education could do and could not do. There was an old saying, " You cannot make a man moral by Act of Parliament ;" neither was it possible to make him happy by Act of Parliament. But he (the speaker) had always thought that in regard to our position both in Ireland and India, though there had doubtless been many sins of commission and shortcomings, what legislation had

not yet done sympathy could do and would do. He believed that to increase the bonds of social sympathy and friendly intercourse between England and India was one of the greatest means of promoting not only the happiness of the people of that country, but of justifying our position in maintaining India as a great branch of the mighty British Empire. Nothing was better calculated to promote that sympathy and social union than those social gatherings which had been alluded to, and in which their friend, Miss Manning, had borne so persevering, so enlightened, so feminine, and so civilizing a part. (Applause.) There was another name which he could not refrain from referring to—the name of a lady whose philanthropic efforts he revered: he referred to the name of the late Miss Carpenter, which would go down to posterity as that of one of the best advisers we have had, as regards social intercourse with the people of India, and as one of the best and truest friends whom the Natives of India have ever been able to claim. (Applause.)

Mr. J. W. BARNES said, from remarks which had been made, it would be supposed that an officer marching through a district in India left a track of destruction and ruin to mark his path. He desired to contradict that. Admitting that the poor ryot very often does not get paid for that which he has supplied, he (Mr. Barnes) could state as a fact that it is one of the greatest difficulties they experienced in the part of the Punjab where he was stationed to enforce the payment. The Political Agent of the State made it a point that every particle that was supplied of any kind, and every service that was rendered, should be paid for. The officers could not possibly place themselves in contact with the ten, twenty, or thirty men who brought supplies to a large camp; but the money was invariably handed over to the Native officers for disbursement, and where non-payment occurred, the onus thereof rested with the Native officials. One of the greatest difficulties they experienced in the part of the Punjab where he was stationed was to insure that the money paid by the European officers for supplies reached the ryots' hands.

Mr. E. B. EASTWICK, C.B., said there had been some diversity of opinion as to the subject which had just been discussed, but he was sure there would be perfect unanimity as to what he had now to bring forward. The Association were favoured in having present in the chair a most distinguished Indian statesman. It was quite certain that no man had gone through the whole career of office in India more completely than Sir Richard Temple had done. He began at the

lowest rank, and he had mounted to the highest, and having filled the important office of Governor of Bombay, he had returned to England to enjoy some leisure. But what leisure? A leisure full of laborious work, for since his return he had published books treating of almost every Indian subject. Of these books it might truly be said, "*Nihil betigit quod non ornavit.*" He (Mr. Eastwick) thought the meeting ought to be grateful to Sir Richard Temple for allotting a portion of his valuable time to coming amongst them to preside over their meeting, and he felt convinced there would be absolute unanimity in according him a hearty vote of thanks, which he (Mr. Eastwick) begged to move.

Mr. P. PIRIE GORDON, in seconding the vote of thanks, said any advocacy of his would be quite superfluous. Their President was too well known and appreciated both here and in India to need any speech on that subject. (Hear, hear.) Before sitting down he might venture a single remark on the interesting subject which had engaged the attention of the meeting. It had been said that the educated classes of India were deeply sensitive; and that, too, was his own experience. He greatly regretted, therefore, that by some one class of British subjects had been referred to as "conquered," and another as "conquerors," in the course of the discussion. The sooner Indians can forget that, and the sooner Englishmen forget, as I believe the vast majority have done, to regard them as conquered, and the sooner they looked upon each other as common citizens of the great British Empire, the better it would be for all concerned.

The motion having been adopted by acclamation,

Sir RICHARD TEMPLE said that, before he responded, he would ask Mr. Khory to make any brief remarks in reply to the criticisms on his paper.

Mr. KHORY said he was glad to see that his paper had elicited such a warm discussion, although in the course of it several questions had been raised, and criticisms passed, which he would have liked to answer. He feared, however, to enter upon a reply, because it would occupy too much time. However, he could not help remarking that those speakers who attempted to contradict several statements that were made in his paper had, no doubt, spoken from their own experience, as they were in high posts for several years in different parts of India, but they were not aware that several instances of ill-

treatment of the Natives by Europeans were hardly brought to their notice, and many cases of the kind were privately compromised through pressure or by the interference of some influential Native. Fearing to swell the bulk of his paper, he had particularly abstained from giving additional instances of the sort which he had taken care to gather from several parts of India. The cases cited on the authority of Mr. Nowrojee Furdoonjee were such as could not be doubted, for Mr. Nowrojee was not the person to publicly make a parade of the shortcomings of our rulers unless he had convinced himself personally of their truth. It was not with the spirit of lowering the Anglo-Indians in the eyes of their people in England that he (Mr. Khory) had attempted to paint the dark side of an Englishman's character in India; his chief aim was to hold the picture in its true colours. Looking at the way in which he had treated the subject, no one could deny that the scale greatly preponderated in favour of our English rulers in India. Several Indian gentlemen who happened to be on the Council of this Association, and who had an opportunity of going through his paper before it was read in the general meeting, expressed their opinion to him to the effect that the paper teemed with flattery. The eloquent speaker that immediately followed him gave out his views and sentiments in such an able and exhaustive manner, that after him there was hardly anything left for him (Mr. Khory) to say. He hoped, however, that Sir Richard Temple would give the meeting the advantage of a short resumé of the proceedings, and that would satisfy him, as Sir R. Temple's experience entitled him to speak with authority.

Sir RICHARD TEMPLE (the Chairman) then rose and said that nothing remained but for him to acknowledge the kindness he had ever received from the Association since he accepted the office of President. Perhaps the meeting might expect him to say one or two words regarding the paper and the discussion they had heard. Well, those who had been in India would, of course, judge for themselves; those who had not, he would tell at once that the allegations made by the lecturer would not be admitted, as a rule, by Englishmen in India; on the contrary, they would be strenuously contradicted by them (Hear, hear.) Nevertheless, he (Sir Richard Temple) felt it to be his duty to attend the meeting and to support the lecturer, for, unless Native gentlemen were encouraged to come and speak out what they think, Anglo-Indians and Englishmen would never be able to catch the progress of public opinion among the Natives of India. (Hear, hear.) It was well, therefore, to encourage Native gentlemen like

Mr. Khory to say all that they had to adduce against the conduct of Englishmen in India. They might consider much of the lecture to be erroneous ; indeed, the lecturer had proceeded in a manner which was certain to conduce to error, by giving specific isolated instances of the conduct of Englishmen, and taking them to be illustrative of the conduct of the large body of Englishmen, over a very extensive area, during a long period of years. It would be easy to prove anything, black or white, by taking separate instances, instead of the general experience and its result. (Hear, hear.) He quite believed, in common with many of the speakers, that half of the instances given by the reader of the paper were incorrect or very exaggerated. Nevertheless, there could be no doubt that the faults to which these instances pointed, and the characteristics which Mr. Khory had endeavoured to portray, are the very faults and weaknesses to which a conquering race is most prone—the very dangers to which an empire like India is likely to be subject. And, therefore, although they might not admit the particular instances which had been cited, it might fairly be acknowledged that there is a tendency towards the faults which the writer has explained in his paper. On the other hand, he was bound to say that instances of a very opposite character might easily be adduced ; and although some incidents of the kind which Mr. Khory mentioned have undoubtedly occurred, the conduct, nevertheless, of the English in India, as a rule, is not such as can be measured by these instances alone. On the whole, it would be easy to show that the conduct of our countrymen in India has been, and is, such as becomes the English race. It must be remembered that no race is free from faults, and that a certain kind of fault is almost inseparable from a certain kind of virtue. Those who are self-reliant and vigorous are apt to be impetuous and imperative. The faults which they are so fond of attributing to us in India are very much those of which we are accused by the nations of Europe. And while we may dispute—and justly dispute—the particular allegations, there is good reason to think that these faults are being gradually cured ; and that, while the Natives of India, on the one hand, advance in intelligence and education and loyalty, the English ruling race, on the other, advance in kindness, self-control, and considerateness. In conclusion, Sir Richard Temple said he did not believe that the assembly would think unkindly of the lecturer, even although they might dispute his facts ; but that they would acknowledge, in a manner becoming to free-speaking Englishmen, the unrestrained frankness with which the lecturer had spoken, the directness with which he had exposed what he believed to be the English faults, and the generosity with which he had acknowledged their imperial virtues.

The following letter on the subject of the discussion was addressed to Mr. W. Hamilton Burn, Secretary of the East India Association :—

“ 16, Manson Place, Queen's Gate, S.W.,

“ June 24th, 1882.

“ DEAR SIR,—A previous engagement will, I regret to say, prevent me from attending the meeting on Monday next, when Mr. E. J. Khory is to read a paper entitled ‘An Englishman in India.’ I have just read the copy of his paper which you were good enough to send, and I sympathize generally with the sentiments which have inspired it.

“ Mr. Khory, after showing how Englishmen in India have often and egregiously failed, in social matters, in their duty to their Indian fellow-subjects, reminds the latter of the inestimable benefits which British rule has conferred upon them; and he advises them, under the circumstances, to control their feelings of irritation. He strongly deprecates their indulging in hopes of liberation from their foreign rulers, and in vain aspirations for self-government, warning them that if such aspirations were realized, they would soon result in anarchy and bloodshed, and ultimately in subjection to a severer despotism than that of their present rulers.

“ The cessation of British rule in India would doubtless be the greatest misfortune which could befall the country in its present condition; but local self-government is by no means inconsistent with the maintenance of British supremacy; on the contrary, it would, by more completely adapting the internal administration to the wants of the people and satisfying their just aspirations, greatly strengthen the hands of the British Government of India, and materially facilitate its task. Local self-government, such as Lord Ripon is at present endeavouring to introduce, would, moreover, by raising the political condition of the people, raise them also in the social scale, and thereby powerfully combat the evil so vividly described by Mr. Khory.

“ Officials in India, it is true, have in several instances evinced antagonism to the Viceroy's proposed measure; but their opposition was doubtless foreseen, and will, it is to be hoped, prove ineffectual, in so far as it proceeds from the disappointment which a measure intended to curtail the power of officials was sure to create. At the same time, it is a remarkable fact that the proposed policy has the sanction of the highest authorities in matters of Indian administration. It may suffice here to quote the opinion of the President of our own Association, whose distinguished career in India, where he

“ filled the highest posts in several provinces, and was for a time a
 “ member of Supreme Government, entitles him to speak on the sub-
 “ ject with great authority.

“ Sir Richard Temple, in his inaugural address to the Association
 “ in March last, said: ‘ Our object in India should be to render the
 “ ‘ Natives fit to be administrators. . . . The more we can do in
 “ ‘ inducing Natives to serve as honorary magistrates, judges of
 “ ‘ Conciliation Courts, jurymen, and municipal commissioners, the
 “ ‘ more we shall be carrying out the true principles of moral educa-
 “ ‘ tion. We should encourage the principle of elective franchise.
 “ ‘ That principle has long obtained in the Municipality of Bombay ;
 “ ‘ and seeing that, some years ago I determined to carry it out in
 “ ‘ Calcutta. . . . The more we carry out the principle in every part
 “ ‘ of the country, the better it will be for us and for India. I rejoice
 “ ‘ to observe that the Government of India will encourage Provincial
 “ ‘ Governments to associate with themselves in the work of local
 “ ‘ financial administration Native gentlemen elected by the voice
 “ ‘ of their fellow-countrymen. It would be, I believe, a most desir-
 “ ‘ able thing for men to be elected in the same way to seats in the
 “ ‘ Legislative Councils, instead of being appointed as they are now.’

“ The general approbation elicited by Sir Richard Temple’s speech
 “ testified the sympathy entertained for the opinions he expressed by
 “ the large meeting which had assembled on that occasion ; and
 “ among the important subjects reviewed in the speech, the develop-
 “ ment of self-government may be considered as the most practical
 “ at the present time, seeing the initiative steps which have already
 “ been taken in the matter.

“ It seems highly desirable, therefore, that the East India Associa-
 “ tion should, through a committee of its members, and under the
 “ guidance of its able President, take up the question of local self-
 “ government in India, with the determination of giving all the
 “ support in its power for enabling the Government of India to carry
 “ through, unimpaired by the undue opposition it is encountering, a
 “ measure calculated so materially to benefit the people, and facilitate
 “ the internal administration of India.

“ The question whether the sound principles on which Lord Ripon
 “ has based his measure, shall receive due effect, or be vitiated
 “ through local influences, will ultimately have to be decided by the
 “ Secretary of State in London. If the Association, therefore, should
 “ determine on taking up the matter, it will doubtless be able,
 “ through its influential members, to obtain seasonable information
 “ of the course and progress of the measure in India, and effectively

“ submit its views to the Indian Secretary of State, by memorials or
“ through deputations, whenever such a course will be deemed
“ expedient.

“ As I shall not have an opportunity of addressing the meeting on
“ Monday, and of submitting to it the views enunciated in this letter,
“ I shall feel much obliged, provided the President sanctions the pro-
“ ceeding, by your communicating my letter to the meeting.

“ I am, dear Sir,

“ Yours faithfully,

“ J. DACOSTA.”

LIST OF LIFE MEMBERS OF THE EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION.

*Marked thus * includes "Journal."*

	Names.	Address.
1.	Abbajee Shivjee, Esq.	Bombay.
2.	Dr. Anunta Chundroba.	Bombay.
3.	Ardaseer Framjee Moos, Esq.	Bombay.
4.	Aspandiarjee Jamshedjee Commissarivala, Esq.	Bombay.
5.	Dr. Atmaram Pandoorang.	Bombay.
6.	Anundroop Kastoorchand, Esq.	Jalna.
7.	H.H. Amrotrao Duffe, Chief of Jutt.	Poona.
*8.	Anundjee Rustomjee, Esq.	Bombay.
*9.	Anundlal Hurridas, Esq.	Rajkote.
10.	Sir W. P. Andrew.	London.
11.	Byramjee Jeejeebhai, Esq., C.S.I.	Bombay.
12.	Byramjee Rustomjee, Esq.	Bombay.
*13.	H.H. Bahadoor Khanjee, Prince of Joonaghud.	Joonaghud.
*14.	Bowdin Meeya, Esq.	Joonaghud.
*15.	His Highness Shree Bawajee, Thakore of Rajkote.	Rajkote.
*16.	Bhaichund Shamjee, Esq.	Bhownugger.
*17.	Bhanjee Keshavjee, Esq.	Chitore.
18.	Alexander Brown, Esq.	Liverpool.
*19.	Dr. Burjorjee Byramjee.	Bhownugger.
20.	Cullindas Shivjee, Esq.	Bombay.
21.	Chhubildas Lalloobhai, Esq.	Bombay.
22.	Cowasjee Merwanjee Hathidaroo, Esq.	Bombay.
23.	J. Clearly, Esq.	Bombay.
24.	H.H. Shrimunt Chimnaje, Chief of Bhore.	Sattara.
25.	J. G. Coleman, Esq.	Madras.
*26.	Cooverjee Coyajee, Esq.	Rajkote.
*27.	Chhuggon Bhaichund Desai, Esq.	Bhownugger.
*28.	Chhuggonlal Suntokram, Esq.	Bhownugger.
*29.	Cursetjee Jehangir Tarachund, Esq.	Bombay.
30.	Cursetjee Furdonjee Parukh, Esq.	Bombay.
*31.	Cursetjee Nusserwanjee Cama, Esq.	Bombay.
32.	A. H. Campbell, Esq.	England.
33.	P. R. Cola, Esq.	
34.	George Crawshaw, Esq.	
*35.	Dadabhai Naoroji, Esq.	Bombay.
*36.	Dadabhoy Byramjee, Esq.	London.
37.	Damodar Heerjee, Esq.	Bombay.
38.	Damodar Tapidas, Esq.	Bombay.
39.	Dhakjee Cassinath, Esq.	Bombay.
40.	Dhunjeebhai Framjee N. Patell, Esq.	Bombay.
41.	Dhunjeebhai Jeevjee Desai, Esq.	Bombay.
42.	Dhunjeebhai Pestonjee, Esq.	Bombay.
43.	Dhunjeebhai Pestonjee, Esq.	Bombay.
44.	Dinshaw Manekjee Petit, Esq.	Bombay.
45.	Dinshaw Shapoorjee Vakeel, Esq.	Bombay.
46.	Dossabhoy Bezunjee, Esq.	Bombay.
47.	Dossabhaji Framjee Cama, Esq.	Jamoo, in Cashmere.
48.	Dossabhaji Framjee Karaka, Esq., C.S.I.	Bombay.
*49.	Dorabjee Pestonjee Cama, Esq.	London.
50.	Dorabjee Puddumju, Esq.	Poona.
51.	Captain F. Duncan.	Calcutta.

	Names.	Address.
*52.	The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Durham.	England.
53.	D. Mookerjee, Esq.	Lucknow.
*54.	Dr. Dorabjee Hormusjee.	Bhooj.
*55.	Dhunjeeshaw Hormusjee Karaka, Esq.	Rajkote.
56.	Dhunjeebhai Pestonjee Commissariwalla, Esq.	Bombay.
57.	D. Ruttonjee, Esq.	Hong Kong.
*58.	H. H. Dajee Rajjee, Thakore of Wudhwan.	Wudhwan.
59.	Eduljee Manekjee Vacha, Esq.	Bombay.
*60.	Edward Backhouse Eastwick, Esq., C.B.	London.
61.	Eduljee Nusserwanjee Colabawalla, Esq.	Bombay.
62.	The Right Hon. Sir James Fergusson, Bart., C.I.E.	Bombay.
63.	Robert Fischer, Esq.	Madras.
*64.	John Fleming, Esq., C.S.I.	London.
65.	Framjee Hormusjee Commissariwalla, Esq.	Bombay.
66.	Framjee Nusserwanjee Patell, Esq.	Bombay.
67.	Dr. P. F. Gomes.	Bombay.
68.	D. A. Gonsalves, Esq.	Bombay.
69.	Gopaldas Mavjee, Esq.	Bombay.
*70.	Patrick Pirie Gordon, Esq.	London.
71.	Gunputrao Bapoosaheb Putverdhan, Esq.	Belgaum.
*72.	Gaorishunker Oodayshunker, Esq.	Bhownugger.
*73.	Thakar Govindjee Dhuramsey, Esq.	Bhooj.
*74.	Gooljee Jeraj, Esq.	Bhooj.
*75.	Rao Saheb Gopaljee Soorbhai.	Rajkote.
76.	Right Honourable Lord John Hay.	London.
77.	Hormusjee Jamsetjee Chetani, Esq.	Kurrachi.
*78.	Huridas ...	Nariad.
*79.	His Highness ...	Indore.
80.	Kazi Shahaboodin, Esq.	Baroda.
81.	Khoja Jaiarajbhai Peerbhai, Esq.	Bombay.
82.	Khan Bahadoor Jamsetjee Dhunjeebhai Wadia.	Bombay.
83.	Janardhan Gopal, Esq.	Bombay.
84.	Javerilal Umashunker Yajnik, Esq.	Bombay.
85.	Jeejeebhai Jehangir Lamna, Esq.	Bombay.
86.	Jehangir Goostadjee, Esq.	Bombay.
87.	Jehangir Merwanjee Pleader, Esq.	Bombay.
88.	Raja Jaykishan Bahadoor.	Mooradabad.
*89.	Rana Jalamsingjee, Esq.	Bhooj.
*90.	Jeram Shivjee, Esq.	Bhooj.
*91.	Jaggonnath Itchbaram, Esq.	Surat.
*92.	Jayantilal Venilal, Esq.	Bhownugger.
*93.	Jeevanbhai Nanabhai, Esq.	Bhownugger.
94.	Jamsetjee Manekjee, Esq.	Jalna.
95.	Kesowjee Naek, Esq.	Bombay.
96.	Khursetjee Rustomjee Cama, Esq.	Bombay.
97.	Kalianrae Hakoomatrae Desai, Esq.	Broach.
*98.	Baboo Katicharan Goshal, Esq.	Satakira.
*99.	H. H. Khachar Alla Chella Khachar, Thakore of Jusdan.	Jusdan.
*100.	Thakar Kursonda Naranjee, Esq.	Bhooj.
*101.	Thakar Kalianjee Pitamber, Esq.	Bhooj.
*102.	Bai Kumlibai of Bilkha.	Rajkote.
*103.	Keshavlal Bhugwanlal Esq.	Jetpore.
*104.	Kohelina Mahajee Saheb, Esq.	Joonaghud.
*105.	Kassinath Trimbuk Telang, Esq.	Bombay.
106.	Khan Bahadoor Yusif Ali.	Bombay.

	Names.	Address.
107.	Luxmidas Khimjee, Esq.	Bombay.
108.	Shreemunt Luxmunrao Madhavrao Putverdharn, Esq.	Belgaum.
109.	Lala Gunga Persad, Esq.	Bareilly.
110.	T. Login, Esq.	Umballa.
*111.	Luxmon Dajee Bevalker, Esq.	Scindh.
*112.	Robert MacIlwraith, Esq.	London.
113.	Manekjee Cursetjee Shroff, Esq.	Bombay.
114.	Merwanjee Rustomjee Dalal, Esq.	Bombay.
115.	Muncherjee Ardeseer Dastoor, Esq.	Bombay.
116.	Muncherjee Cowasjee Murzaban, Esq.	Bombay.
117.	Manekjee Cowasjee Damonwalla, Esq.	Dhurampoor.
118.	Dewan Mathradas, Dewan of Kapoortalla.	Kapoortalla.
119.	Mathooradas Lowjee, Esq.	Bombay.
120.	Merwanjee Hormusjee Meheta, Esq.	Calcutta.
*121.	Mirza Abbas Bey, Esq.	Lucknow.
*122.	H.H. Mohobut Khanjee, K.C.S.I., Nawab of Joonaghud.	Joonaghud.
123.	Muncherjee Naorojee Banajee, Esq.	Bombay.
124.	Dr. Manekjee Aderjee.	Bombay.
125.	Sir Munguldas Nathoobhai, Kt., C.S.I.	Bombay.
*126.	Nakoda Mahomed Ali Rogay, Esq.	Bombay.
127.	Nanabhai Manekjee Guzadar, Esq.	Bombay.
128.	Naorojee Dossabhai, Esq.	Bombay.
*129.	Narayan Ramchandra Dhurandhare, Esq.	Bombay.
130.	Nusserwanjee Cursetjee Ghandhi, Esq.	Bombay.
131.	Nusserwanjee Jehangir Wadia, Esq.	Bombay.
*132.	Nursingprasad Hurriprasad, Esq.	Joonaghud.
*133.	Nurbheram Hurjeevan, Esq.	Bhooj.
*134.	Nazir Mirzan Meeya, Esq.	Bhooj.
*135.	Nagindas V. Esq.	Rajkote.
*136.	Narayan	Wudhwan.
*137.	Nialchundi Koopsnunkur, Esq.	Joonaghud.
*138.	Nanna Meeya Saheb of Ahmedabad.	Joonaghud.
*139.	H.H. the Nawab of Randhunpoor.	Randhunpoor.
140.	Honourable Justice Nanabhai Hurridas.	Bombay.
*141.	Ootamram Nurbheram, Esq.	Surat.
*142.	Rev. Harman C. Ogle.	Oxford.
143.	Pallonjee Curs-tjee Cama, Esq.	Bombay.
144.	Pestonjee Dinshaw, Esq.	Bombay.
145.	Pestonjee Hormusjee Cama, Esq.	Bombay.
*146.	Pirozeshaw Ruttonjee Cama, Esq.	Bombay.
147.	Raja Promonath Raja Bahadoor.	Dighapatham.
148.	Baboo Prasonna Kinara Survadhikari, Esq.	Calcutta.
149.	Baboo Piarichurna Surkar, Esq.	Calcutta.
150.	P. A. Meheta, Esq.	Hong Kong.
*151.	Peer Lutfulla Rahimdin, Esq.	Bhooj.
*152.	Prabhashunkar Gowrishunkar, Esq.	Bhownugger.
*153.	Pestonjee Byramjee Kotwal, Esq.	Kurrachi.
*154.	H. H. the Thakore of Palitana.	Palitana.
155.	Raghoonathgur Ratigur, Esq.	Bombay.
156.	Raghoonath Narayan Khote, Esq.	Bombay.
157.	Revagur Coovergur, Esq.	Bombay.
158.	Stewart Erskine Rolland, Esq.	London.
159.	Rustomjee Nusserwanjee Khory, Esq., M.D.	Bombay.
160.	Rustomjee Sorabjee Commissariwalla, Esq.	Bombay.

	Names.	Address.
161.	Ruttonjee Bomonjee Dubash, Esq.	Bombay.
*162.	H.H. the Rao of Cutch.	Bhooj.
163.	H.H. Ramchandrarao Appa Saheb, Chief of Jamkhundi.	Jamkhundi.
164.	Rustomjee Vicajee Merjee, Esq.	D. Hydrabad.
165.	H.H. Ram Vurma, Maharajah of Travancore.	Travancore.
*166.	Ruttonjee Keshowjee Kothari, Esq.	Bhooj.
*167.	Rajgur Laljee Ludhjee, Esq.	Bhooj.
*168.	Raojee Heerachund Meheta, Esq.	Bhooj.
*169.	Messrs. Rustomjee Merwanjee and Sons.	Bhooj.
170.	Ranchoredas Meghjee, Esq.	Bombay.
171.	G. F. Remington, Esq.	England.
*172.	H.H. Runmulsingjee, Rajsahab of Dhangadhra.	Dhangadhra.
173.	His Excellency Raghonath Rao.	Indore.
*174.	Sir A. D. Sassoon.	Bombay.
175.	F. Schiller, Esq.	Bombay.
176.	Sorabjee Framjee Patell, Esq.	Bombay.
*177.	Sorabjee Shapoorjee Bengalee, Esq.	Bombay.
178.	Shamuldas Purmanundas, Esq.	Bhownugger.
*179.	Jamadar Sale Hindi, Esq.	Joonaghud.
*180.	H.H. the Chief of Sangli.	Poona.
*181.	Maharaja Sahibhundra Rae Bahadoor.	Kishnaghur.
*182.	Sahibhundra Rae Bahadoor.	Bhooj.
183.	Sorabjee Naorojee Cooper, Esq.	Bombay.
*184.	Sarabhai Muggonbhai Currumchand, Esq.	Ahmedabad.
*185.	P. M. Tait, Esq.	London.
186.	Tapidas Vurjdas, Esq.	Bombay.
187.	H.H. the Thakore of Chitore.	Chitore.
188.	Vallubhjee Toolseydas, Esq.	Bombay.
189.	Vundrawandas Purshotomdas, Esq.	Bombay.
190.	Vundrawandas Purshotomdas, Esq.	Bombay.
*191.	Rajnarayan Narayan Mundlik, C.S.I.	Bombay.
*192.	Meheta Vulubhjee Luddha, Esq.	Bhooj.
*193.	Vishachandrarao Ghorvishunker, Esq.	Bhownugger.
*194.	Vishachandrarao Ghorvishunker, Esq.	Bhownugger.
*195.	Captain William George Grove.	British Burmah.
*196.	Walla Soorjee Gunga, Esq., Shareholder of Jetpore.	Jetpore.
*197.	Walla Wallera Jussa, Esq., ditto.	Jetpore.
*198.	Walla Gorkha Meriam, Esq., ditto.	Jetpore.
*199.	Walla Jiva Gunga, Esq., ditto.	Jetpore.
*200.	Walter Wren, Esq.	London.

TO THE MOST HONOURABLE THE MARQUIS OF HARTINGTON, HER MAJESTY'S SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA.

From the Council of the East India Association.

MY LORD,—We desire respectfully to draw your Lordship's attention to certain proceedings of the Bombay Legislative Council on June 21st, the subject of which can scarcely have escaped your notice.

2. The Bill before the Council was one to give power to the Executive authorities to "frame rules to regulate the traffic and "possession of Mhowa or M'húa flowers," on the ground that these flowers are sometimes used for the purposes of illicit distillation.

3. All the five non-official members of the Council, including two representatives of European mercantile firms, spoke and voted against the Bill; and the advices we receive from Western India indicate that public feeling runs very strongly against the measure, which is regarded as a needless and oppressive extension of the Excise laws, to which the Hon. Sir Jamsetjee Jeejeebhoy, and other members, referred as being already unduly stringent and severe. Thus, if the proposed Bill becomes law by votes of the official members of Council alone, it will be regarded as little better than a stretch of arbitrary authority.

4. The chief ground on which the enactment is opposed is that the M'húa flower (*Bassia latifolia*) provides an important and valuable article of food and condiment during the hot weather, when several other fresh vegetable products become scarce and dear. The following is the description of this edible blossom as given in the official *Gazetteer* under the head "Khandeish :"—"M'húa.—Its chief value lies in the "pulpy bell-shaped flower which, when dried, is eaten by the Natives, "and is distilled into the common spirit of the country. Almost every "animal, wild or domestic, eats the fresh flowers. It is an important "article of trade, and, during the hot months, is the chief means "of subsistence to the Bhils and other hill tribes."* As to the alleged use of the M'húa flower for illicit distillation, we submit that the ordinary Excise regulations should be sufficient to check such small infraction of the law, if administered with due vigilance; and that it is a stretch of official legislative authority, which almost amounts to an abuse, to bring the whole crop of a wild food product under

* See also letter in *Times of India*, June 27th, signed "J. C. L.," giving full particulars of the M'húa flower, and its uses, from Drury, Beddome, and other scientific authorities.

police supervision, which must check its legitimate and wholesome use by the people.


5. We trust that your Lordship in Council will refrain from giving sanction to this proposed addition to Act V. of 1878 until, at least, the full report of the proceedings of the Legislative Council, held at Poona last month, is placed before your Council. This will afford an opportunity for remonstrance against the measure; and, in the meantime, we feel it our duty to draw your Lordship's attention to the all but universal expression of reprobation that the measure has called forth in Western India. This general condemnation of the Bill is manifested in all the Bombay journals, Anglo-Indian as well as Native, delivered in London on the 19th instant, to which we would ask that reference may be made in corroboration of what we have urged above.†

6. We may also be permitted to suggest, that inquiry might suitably be made by your Lordship as to whether, in other respects, the Abkari regulations are not too minute, and liable to interfere with the domestic and industrial pursuits of the people.

On behalf of the Council of the East India Association,

(Signed) EDWARD B. EASTWICK, Chairman,
RAMPAL SINGH, Vice-Chairman.

* Amongst others, see *Bombay Gazette* Summary of June 27th, pp. 2,4,8,10, and 15; also *Indian Spectator* and *Native Opinion* of June 25th, and *Indu Prokash* of 26th.





JOURNAL
OF THE
EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION.

Instituted for the independent and disinterested advocacy and promotion, by all legitimate means, of the public interests and welfare of the Inhabitants of India generally.

Why should India pay for the Conquest of Egypt?

PAPER BY H. M. HYNDMAN, Esq.

READ AT A MEETING OF THE EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION,
NOVEMBER 28TH, 1882.

THOMAS C. THOMPSON, Esq., M.P. FOR DURHAM,
IN THE CHAIR.

A MEETING of the members of the East India Association, and others interested in the affairs of India, was held on Tuesday afternoon, November 28, 1882, at the "Pall Mall," Regent Street, London, the subject for consideration being: "Why should India pay for the Conquest of Egypt?" opened by Mr. H. M. Hyndman.

THOMAS C. THOMPSON, Esq., M.P., for Durham, occupied the chair, and amongst those present were the following: Lord Stanley of Alderley; Mr. Edward B. Eastwick, C.B., and Mrs. Eastwick; Major-General G. Burn; Major-General C. M. Shakespear; Colonel G. Battye; Colonel R. M. Macdonald; Colonel G. B. Mangleson, C.S.I.; Colonel W. A. Ross; Captain W. J. Eastwick; Captain W. C. Palmer; Rev. J. Long; Raja Rampal Singh; Dr. G. B. Clark; Miss Allen; Mr. A. Arathoon; Mr. C. W. Arathoon; Mrs. Badger; Mr. George Bain; Mr. James R. Boyd; Mr. S. Burjorjee Broacha; Mirza Peer Bukhsh; Mr. Herbert Burrows; Mr. J. Butcher; Mr. Dadabhoy Byramjee; Mr. Pestonjee Byramjee; Mr. D. D. Cama; Mr. William Clarke, M.A.; Mr. K. B. Dutt; Mr. and Miss Fisher; Mr. C. Fitzgerald; Mr. G. Foggo; Mr. H. W. Freeland; Mr. W. J. Grazebrooke; Mrs. Hyndman; Mr. and Mrs. Frederick Hyndman

Mr. S. A. Kapadia; Mr. Charles A. Lawson; Mr. T. S. Lemon; Mr. Roper Lothbridge, C.I.E.; Mr. Lyon; Mr. Francis Mathew (Bombay); Mr. William McGuffin; Mr. W. J. Morgan; Mr. M. Mowat; Mr. Alfred Neighbour; Professor G. Oppert; Mr. J. A. Partridge; Mr. R. D. Phookan; Mr. Alexander Rogers; Mr. A. K. Sethna; Mr. John Shaw (Madras); Mr. Southey; Mrs. Speller; Mr. J. Swinton (of New York); Mr. William Tayler; Mr. M. J. Wallhouse; Mr. William White; Mr. Howard Williams; Mr. W. Martin Wood; Mr. W. Hamilton Burn (Secretary).

In opening the proceedings the CHAIRMAN said that democratic meetings were probably best held in the later hours of the day, and it was pretty certain that at three o'clock in the afternoon they could not expect so large an attendance as if the assembly was called for an hour when the working day was closed. But he was free to say that the sympathy with the cause they were met to advocate was not at all the less throughout the country, although the great body of their fellow-citizens were prevented, by the hour of meeting, from being present. (Hear, hear.) They were aware that the subject for consideration was a lecture by Mr. Hyndman upon the unwisdom—to use no more forcible term—of extracting from Indian resources any part of the expenditure incurred in relation to the Egyptian troubles. For himself he might say he did not want to express any definite fixed opinion upon the matter; he only wished to introduce Mr. Hyndman to the meeting, if indeed even that was not superfluous. But he must say he felt great pleasure in executing that commission, and that he could not resist the offered temptation of taking the chair on the occasion, because he believed that there was no man in England—perhaps no man in the world—whose sympathies were so wide as those of Mr. Hyndman for that class which so seldom gathers where it labours, so rarely reaps where it sows. (Hear, hear.) There is nothing probably more interesting, nothing more momentous, and, perchance, more dangerous than the great democratic movement taking place all over the world; and if not in this generation then certainly in the next there must arise, if evil is to be avoided, wise and careful statesmen, considerate of the interests of the poor. Upon this contingency must turn the most momentous issues; for the rights of property, the claims of religion, and all else that goes to make civilized society, as we know it, will come up for judgment and reconsideration. Mr. Hyndman is one of those who perceive the magnitude of the approaching crisis. (Hear, hear.) But, to revert to the topic more immediately before them, he might remind the

meeting that the Egyptian Expedition was said, by two different parties, to have had two different objects or purposes. One party alleged that the ulterior motive was to conquer and take possession of the country—a country which does not belong to us—and thus to further the interests of the great and influential monied classes in this country. The other party, represented by men held in high respect and admiration by many—to wit, the present English Ministry—protest that the Expedition to Egypt was, in origin, an act of self-defence. But whether the Expedition was inspired by one motive or the other, it seemed to him an almost self-evident proposition that in either case the English Government, and no other, should be called upon to pay the cost. (Hear, hear.) He would call their attention for one moment to the peculiar condition of this country in relation to the world. England is a very small island holding enormous colonial dependencies. Profiting by the sad experience of the last century we have learnt the secret of keeping our Colonial Empire. It is that we should leave our colonies alone. (Hear, hear.) But besides our colonies we have other enormous dependencies, and the most magnificent in the world is our dominion in the East Indies. There also, while the character of our relations with the people is very different from that which exists between the colonies and the mother country, the people are gradually rising in intelligence. India is, indeed, a poor country; it has been so for long, and is not now in the condition it ought to be; but there is good reason for believing that under the genial influence of English Government the people, as a whole, are gradually rising. If we want to maintain our rule in India, depend upon it our only course is to do with that great country as we have done with our colonies, and so develop and train the energies of the people that they may be able to govern themselves. To hasten that end we must consistently strive to make them as happy and as rich as we can. He had been reading the last report of the Indian Finance Minister, and he observed that he laid it down as a proposition that there was nothing that England should endeavour more strongly to secure than the diminution of the burdens of the Indian people, a diminution of the expense of military forces in India. Nothing is more ruinous to India than the drain of the expenditure upon the enormous military forces we keep up. There is an army there more expensive than our own; and what Major Baring says in effect is, that if we are to maintain India in happiness, and wish to continue the possession of that magnificent dependency as a heritage to our children, we can only do so by relieving the people of the heavy burden of taxation. And now to connect this injunction with the special

object of their meeting that day. The Government have allowed it to be understood that they look for India to share in the expenses of the recent campaign in Egypt, but it is true that they expressly state that they have come to no final conclusion on the subject. We know, however, what has happened in the past, and foreboding is amply justified. We made India pay all the expense of the Afghan War—for the help we extended we have regarded as a claim upon her which she must repay; and there is abundant reason for the belief that that war was not carried on by the will of the Indian people. But, be that as it may, it is certain that the great body of the Indian people know nothing of Egypt or of the “hostilities” for the expenses of which we design to call upon them to contribute. What is our national interest in Egypt? Is it not that we should secure a rapid means of access to India? Is it to be believed that the Indian people would give a penny to maintain that road open for themselves? He thought not. They look to us for protection and for help; but they know that we extend it less in their interest than in our own. (Hear, hear.) The Chairman then called upon Mr. Hyndman to read his paper.

Mr. H. M. HYNDMAN, on rising, prefaced the reading of his paper by the following remarks:—

Mr. Chairman, Ladies, and Gentlemen,—Before entering on the subject of the meeting to-day, I desire to say a few words just to intimate that although Mr. Thompson, one of the few—the very few— independent members of the House of Commons, has to-day done me the honour of taking the chair, he is not bound by the strong expressions in the paper I am about to read. I alone am responsible for what I say. Mr. Thompson cannot be held to approve of all that is said. Mr. Hyndman then proceeded as follows:—

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES, AND GENTLEMEN,—In rising to address such an audience as that now present on the subject of the proposal of the Liberal Government to charge a considerable portion of the cost of our undeclared war against Egypt on the revenues of India, I feel that I have undertaken the rather bootless task of preaching to the converted. There are few or none here, I feel confident, who have not already made up their minds on this question; and if the vote given in this room to-day could settle the matter, India would at once be relieved—of that there can be no doubt—of making any payment whatsoever. But our object in meeting here extends far beyond the limits of this gathering. The East India Association, founded by a few noble, earnest, self-sacrificing men, was established in order that

the cause of justice to India might be steadily advocated among the English people, when Government, Parliament, and politicians at large were deaf—and when are they ready to hear?—to her just claims.

There is just now, unfortunately, even more than the usual apathy with relation to Indian business. That indifference which is felt in all home and foreign concerns affects, of course, even more seriously the affairs of India. To produce any effect whatever in this case, our protest must reach outside the lines of both the great political parties in the State; must be loud enough, clear enough, and convincing enough to stir that great mass of our countrymen who, caring little for Tory or Conservative, Whig, Liberal or Radical, are as I, for one, firmly believe, ready to resent the gross injustice about to be done in their name to the many races and nations for whose welfare they are directly responsible. To those who have actual knowledge of India, whether Natives of India or Englishmen, those who suffer cannot but look to speak and act on their behalf. Such men—and I see many before me—can speak with authority to the masses of the people. Differing, as we may, on many points in relation to the administration of our great dependency, we are at least agreed on this: that for wealthy England to throw the cost of her imperial war against Egypt on to the shoulders of the miserably poor ryots of India would be an act of meanness that could not fail to degrade our country in the eyes of the whole civilized world.

May I urge, then, the members of this Association to earn the gratitude of those whom they are striving to serve by beginning a definite agitation against the shameful proposal made on behalf of the Government last session by the Secretary of State. Pressure from without is needed to bring home anything to party leaders. Can we think that mere afternoon meetings, which only the upper and middle classes with leisure can possibly attend, will really have much influence? I would beg the members of this valuable Association to abjure that delusion, and to appeal directly to men and women who know what hard work and short commons are themselves, not to allow their starving fellow-subjects to be yet further injured. From them justice may be obtained and forced upon our rulers. It is important that this should be done at once; for, unless I greatly mistake, this affair of the cost of the Egyptian war will be taken as a test of our honesty and sincerity when we here at home talk of justice to India. We ourselves are raising up in that great country keen critics of our every action. The schoolmaster is abroad at last in India as well as in England.

Natives who come here and see the seamy side of our boasted civilization in the squalor and degradation of the thousands in our great cities, Natives who remain at home to watch the constant importation of European ideas, form their own opinions as to what is going on. If they learn that all the talk about the well-being of a subject population is so much cant; if they note that both parties in the State combine in the profession of a convenient hypocrisy, then all hope of loyalty from them is at an end, and every man whom we educate is an enemy the more to contend with. Show the English people the real truth on this matter if you wish our constant talk of justice to be any better than a sham.

Before entering upon the main question we are here to discuss I desire to say a few words on the political connection between India and England since the Mutiny. That great upheaval changed, as we all know, the relative positions of the two countries. The great Company delivered up its trust into the hands of the people. Up to the year 1858, Englishmen generally could not be considered as directly responsible for the good government of India and the just treatment of its inhabitants. Whatever mistakes were made by the East India Company—and, in my humble judgment, the Board of Directors at home were guilty of fewer than is often supposed—it stood between Englishmen and their great dependency. But the Company was easy of attack, and in the latter years of its rule certainly many scandals which now pass unchallenged, if it suits party leaders that they should so pass, would have met with universal reprobation. Since 1858, however, every English voter has borne his share, whether he likes it or not, in the good or evil of our administration. The buffer has been removed, and for the last four-and-twenty years the English democracy could, at any moment, if they chose, insist upon the reversal of any policy in India. At times, as in the reversal of the Afghan policy, they have so insisted. The power is there. We need but to call it into play. No one disputes, indeed, that the House of Commons is the ultimate Court of Political Appeal for India in all matters of the highest moment. To that assembly all look for redress of wrongs, hopeless though the expectation of improvement too often is. But what is the House of Commons in relation to Indian matters? Nothing more than a caucus to register and enforce the decrees of the Government of India and the Cabinet.

Who has not marvelled at the apathy of the majority of members with respect to all Indian business? There is an old story of a famous lawyer who had to appear in a great case before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. It was a really great case, involving questions

of importance to the community at large. The circumstances were complicated, the weather hot, the chamber where the cause was heard close and uncomfortable. By degrees the sustained arguments of the learned counsel, clear and admirable as they were, clouded the faculties of the worthy judges on the bench. They one by one nodded, not in acquiescence, but in slumber, till at length the majority of them listened blandly with closed eyes to the contentions of the orator, and his periods were wafted to them softly o'er the fields of sleep. Then the learned counsel turned to one of his friends and said, "What a miserable affliction it is upon a man of "ability to have to argue important issues before a pack of old "washerwomen." I assure you, Sir, that sometimes when on a broiling day in the middle of August I have strolled down to that least democratic of all so-called popular assemblies, the House of Commons, and have seen a Secretary of State for India rise with an air of infinite boredom to address some two-score worn-out legislators, white, weary, and woebegone, I have thought of the late Lord Westbury's scornful ejaculation. The matter to be considered is the Indian Budget. Exhausted, maybe, with their efforts to do justice to Ireland in the shape of the infamous Coercion Acts, which you, Sir, and a few others so nobly withstood, their physique reduced by the consideration of such intensely interesting matters as the details of a Bankruptcy Bill, or the description of muzzle to be applied to too independent members; thus depressed with overwork, I say, the members of the greatest imperial assembly in the world can devote only the dregs of their intelligence to the less important subject of the life and death interests of 200,000,000 of people.

There, Sir, is the root of the whole mischief. This neglect of India, for which you, as I know, think Parliament is responsible, is the reason why this Association meets here to-day. Once in every few years, doubtless when some fearful famine has forced home the truth, even to shareholders and pensioners, that millions cannot perish of starvation when there is plenty for all; once in every few years a sort of philanthropic feeling is aroused among us, and a spasmodic effort is made to understand what is going wrong. But very soon the Anglo-Indian official gentlemen who, I am quite convinced, have persuaded themselves that all is for the best, and act in perfect good faith, come forward to instruct their countrymen. Volume after volume, each in succession heavier alike in bulk and in style than its predecessor, is issued from the press to counteract the fatal facts and figures of the Blue Books. We are assured that these high-placed administrators have carefully re-surveyed their own handiwork, and

find it very good. Representatives and constituents alike fall back in the comfortable armchair of moral self-complacency, and the next news is that India is brimming over with wealth and surpluses to such an extent that really it would be unfair to her—she would resent it—if she were not allowed to pay the cost of a nice little war of aggression on Egypt, which has given a Liberal Government, or so it is said, a fresh lease of popularity.

When, Sir, the great East India Company gave up the government of India to the English people at large, that courageous, upright, and conscientious man, the late Mr. John Stuart Mill, penned a memorandum of protest, justification, and warning on behalf of his old employers. He predicted that evil might come from this very party extravagance and party neglect which now we see. He thought that mischief to India must arise from the change unless great care were taken. Who shall deny that he has proved right? For the last four-and-twenty years we have been engaged in developing India on the most improved capitalist principles—in introducing all the Europeanization we could manage; yet the people are miserably poor as a whole, and taxed beyond what is fair or right. The paper published in the August number of the *Journal* of this Society, by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji—one of the best works on behalf of India ever done even by this Association—remains unanswered and unanswerable. I trust it may yet be printed in a cheaper form. Therein is shown clearly that even in the Punjab the people are unable under existing circumstances to obtain the bare necessities of healthy existence. But we need not Native evidence to prove to us that not only the people—the agricultural population, three-fourths of the whole—are poor, but that they are getting poorer as time rolls on. I will not here weary you with all the admissions that are made in report after report. Enough that Dr. W. W. Hunter, the principal statist of India, gives figures to show that 40,000,000 people in India “are going through life on insufficient food,” but those very figures he gives show that not 40,000,000 but nearly 100,000,000 are passing through life in semi-starvation. These now are they whom our Premier and his subordinates would grind down yet lower in order that we may escape some portion of the cost of our glorious victories over Arabi Pasha and his miserable fellahen. I say that the agricultural population whom we propose to tax for this war are becoming poorer, and the Government know it. How can they help knowing it? Lord Hartington and Lord Northbrook, Mr. Gladstone, and Mr. Fawcett, to say nothing of permanent officials such as Sir Louis Mallet, Sir Thomas Seccomb, Mr. Waterfield, and others, have the facts before them as well as we. They have noted

the hopeless attempts of their own picked men to refute Mr. Dadabhai and others. But the word goes round, hush! Would you weaken or destroy the imperial tradition? Would you admit that—to use a vulgar phrase—the bottom has fallen out of our Indian Administration? It is unpatriotic—dangerous. It would never do. The facts cannot be disputed, the figures tell their own tale, but venture to draw the manifest deductions and you endanger the Empire. It is they, not we, who endanger the Empire.

Here, Sir, is an instance of how this works. Colonel R. D. Osborn, a gentleman, I think, known to many in this room, was invited to deliver a lecture by the University of Cambridge on any Indian subject. He chose the most important of all—one on which he is specially qualified to speak: “The Condition of the Agricultural Population of India.” Then word came from the India Office that this would be an inconvenient subject, the University was requested not to allow the address to be delivered, and Colonel Osborn was not permitted to proceed. I do not wonder at that at all. If once the people of England begin to understand the real condition of the mass of their fellow-subjects, they will take very good care that the upper and middle classes, who alone benefit by this misery, should pay the entire cost of the Egyptian or any other war.

For what you have to-day, Mr. Chairman, Ladies, and Gentlemen, is that relentless, that hopeless cruelty known as class interest. Much of the mischief is done because the breeches pocket keeps the mind in safe custody. Greed for gain eats out the moral sense, and ignorance is too convenient to disturb itself. The upper and middle classes of England drag from India every year from 20,000,000*l.* to 30,000,000*l.* sterling, without any commercial return. This subject has many and many a time been discussed before this Association, but it cannot be repeated too often. For, till this fearful truth is forced home to Englishmen, hope of prosperity for India there is none. Sir Louis Mallet and Sir John Strachey put the drain at 20,000,000*l.* Take it at that, then. In the shape of interest, profit, pensions, and home charges, the governing classes draw from India each year, whether famine is raging or not, more than the entire nett land revenue of the whole of India. What do you say to that? This represents—I am speaking according to official statements—the value of the food of more than 10,000,000 human beings for a whole year. Why, increasing impoverishment is certain so long as this goes on. No man can stay it. If England sent from her shores each year 80,000,000*l.* or more; if she, too, were cumbered up with foreigners in every office of emolument and consideration; if we were forced to

pay for the invasion of Tunis or the expedition to Mexico by a French Assembly, why, I take it we should not need to look further for the cause, when starvation and famine, disease and pestilence came upon our households and decimated our population. If you doubt me, read the official reports of the miserable underfeeding of men, women, and children in Madras and Bombay, in the Central Provinces and Oude. Consult my friend, Mr. Robert Elliott, as to what he thinks of the awful deterioration of the soil. Study Sir James Caird, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Buck, Mr. Harman, as skilled agriculturists, on the same question of steady decrease of produce to acreage planted, and then, as Englishmen and Englishwomen who have your share in causing this misery, ask yourselves whether, in order to provide another happy hunting-ground for young gentlemen at large—another field for the lucrative employment of middle-class capital—the impoverished ryots of India should be thrust further forward into another famine period, even to save a Liberal Government the unpopularity of making two ends meet at home.

For that is where the shoe pinches. Our people are poor, too. I know that; but they, at least, can talk, can vote, can agitate, can threaten loss of office to either Conservative or Liberal. India is silent and unrepresented. Her 200,000,000 cannot muster a single vote; her, therefore, it is safe to fleece; she is ever fair game. Lord Metcalfe, in a phrase that has become almost too trite for quotation, said that India would be lost on the floor of the House of Commons. If it is, it will be by party meanness more than from any other cause.

But, Sir, it is urged that the finances of India are so flourishing that she may just as well pay as we. I will not inflict on our friends a criticism of the Indian Budget. The bogus surplus which has so often done duty has vanished once more. Lord Hartington himself confessed in his Budget speech that he could make neither head nor tail of the figures put before him. But this, at any rate, is clear, that, although a will-of-the-wisp surplus flitted through the Council Chamber of Calcutta and the English House of Commons, all the financiers in England have not yet been able to lay a grain of salt upon its tail. If there is a surplus, why this persistent borrowing? If there is a surplus, why sell off the reserve chests of opium? If there is a surplus, why deplete the cash balances to danger point? If there is a surplus, why . . . ? But I need go no further than this. We are approaching another famine period, the cost of administration has increased, the drain to England is heavier than ever. Where are the grain stores recommended by the Famine Commission? where the economies counselled by the

Committee of the House of Commons? Alas! Sir, it is the old story of the spendthrift who counts his debts as his capital, and goes thoughtlessly along to the gravest embarrassment. I cannot but think, Sir, that this eternal borrowing by itself must at last open the eyes of the English people to the mischievous system which is going on. But where, then, is the wealth of India if more loans are perpetually needed? How can she so readily afford to pay? Gladly, Sir, would I hear a Native Indian financier—Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, or Sir Madhava Rao, for instance—boldly criticise, in a crowded House of Commons, all the financial juggling which is going on at the expense of his own people. Politicians might laugh; the people would listen.

It so happens that, as we all are well aware, another imperial war was waged against Afghanistan a very few years ago. It was waged against a country bordering on India, between whose inhabitants and the dwellers on the plains of Hindostan there has been war and hatred for generations. This Association protested against that war as contrary to Indian interests. But the late Conservative Government, rightly or wrongly, invaded Afghanistan as the present Liberal Government has invaded Egypt. They invaded Afghanistan because it was said that Shere Ali meant mischief to our rule in India, being egged on thereto by Russia. It was admitted to be an imperial war, fought for imperial purposes, because we were at variance with Russia in Eastern Europe. The invasion was expressly defended on that ground, but the late Government most wrongly, improperly, and meanly charged the total cost of that war to the revenues of India. India has actually paid 17,000,000*l.* for that war. For my part I consider the fact that she did pay this enormous sum as most discreditable to us, and I did my best, in common with some I see here, to prevent it. But, now, condemning this act of meanness most strongly, let us see for a moment what was said by the statesmen who were then out of office, and who are now proposing to charge India with the cost of their war against Egypt. Afghanistan was at least close at hand. Shere Ali *might* have been the head of a Russian advanced guard for an army of the future. Afghans and Punjabis are traditional foes. But Egypt? Well, let us hear what our present Ministers said:—

Mr. GLADSTONE, speaking in the House of Commons, declared that
 “ the Indian people have had nothing to do with this war; they are
 “ wholly guiltless; they wash their hands in innocence so far as the
 “ war is concerned. They have no representative here or elsewhere.
 “ The very powers which the law once gave to defend them, when the
 “ East India Company existed, have either been taken away by Par-
 “ liament or nullified by the action of the Government and the vote

“ of the House of Commons. Can I bring myself to believe that the expenses of this struggle, which is wholly our act, shall be placed upon India? I say ‘No,’ and I will go forth into any assembly of Englishmen and tell them I say ‘No,’ and appeal to them whether they will say ‘No’ also. Nay, I am persuaded—such is my opinion of their generosity—that when they thoroughly understand the facts of the case, they will say distinctly that *those who make the war should pay for the war. Those who make war for purposes, whether they be or be not Indian purposes, are the right persons upon whom should rest finally the charges.*” (Hansard, Vol. ccxliii., p. 898.)

Mr. Gladstone, on the 31st of July, called these, his own words, nonsense, and denied that he had ever spoken them. They read awkwardly to-day, no doubt. But they are his impassioned utterances all the same—when in opposition.

Mr. Fawcett, on the same occasion, when Mr. Gladstone thus eloquently championed the cause of the people whom he has now determined to oppress, was of opinion that “the Afghan War was for Imperial far more than Indian purposes, and that, therefore, it was as unjust as ungenerous to come down to the House and say ‘India should pay everything.’ . . . If the war was to maintain the influence and character of England in Europe, could there be anything more unfair, more unworthy of this country, than to use the moneys of the people of India to maintain that position and character, and to enable us to parade ourselves before the world as a great Imperial Power. . . . He did not think that that Imperialism would long survive which was decked out in garments purchased with the money of starving ryots and the miserable peasantry of India.”

Lord Northbrook stated plainly: “I consider the war to be the direct consequence of the state of affairs in Europe, and not to have arisen from anything immediately connected with our Indian Empire. For that reason, if for no other, India should not be called upon to bear the cost.”

Thus, an ex-Viceroy can find as First Lord of the Admiralty that India should pay in the case of Egypt what was monstrous as applied to Afghanistan.

“Surely,” said Mr. Mundella, “if it was an Indian war, let them do justice and charge it on the Indian revenues. If it was an English and Imperial war, let it be paid out of English funds.”

Thus then, Mr. Gladstone and Lord Northbrook, Mr. Fawcett and Mr. Mundella, every one of the men who are supposed to sway the present Government in Indian matters, denounced in the strongest terms,

vehemently stigmatized as "a swindle," the proposal to charge the Afghan War to India. Truly moral and very right. Who can forget, furthermore, what our prize political gladiator, Sir William Harcourt, ready to draw his theatrical sword for or against any conceivable proposition, who can forget what he said on the occasion? The monstrosity of the thing absolutely reached even his moral sense. The Conservatives hesitated on some financial point. "Put it," said Sir William, bitterly, "put it on the mild Hindoo." Sir, the present Government—Sir William, and the rest of them—have acted literally on what was meant as a bitter sarcasm; they have contrived to put it—put it on the mild Hindoo. See how their attitude has varied as their seats have changed. All talk about swindle is now indecent—all their denunciations are "nonsense." They have no recollection of having said anything of the kind. Hansard himself has become of a sudden a false reporter of misrepresented statesmen. All scruples, in short, float off comfortably down the placid stream of political advantage.

I confess, Sir, there is one whom it hurts me to find in this boatload of political hypocrites. For many years past Mr. Henry Fawcett has stood forward as the member for India. If, as a typical middle-class economist, he has refused to look beyond the mere superficial aspects of the impoverishment of India, it is even the more to his honour that he never ceased to proclaim that India is poor, and to protest, indifferent to friend or foe, against the injustice which both parties have combined to inflict upon her. Office, sad to say, has deprived India of her sole effective parliamentary champion. I cannot believe that Mr. Fawcett too has taken the shilling to serve in the ranks of the enemies of India, his speech at Hackney forbids me to think that, yet he sat silent and unashamed in his seat of Postmaster-General when Lord Hartington, as Chief Secretary, proposed that the cost of the Indian troops should be defrayed by the Indian ryots. Surely if ever India stood in need of Mr. Henry Fawcett's services she wanted them that day.

But there is the less excuse for this proposal that the Government of India itself has sent home a strong protest against this iniquity. Not even an imaginary surplus could be conjured up if this thing were done. Lord Ripon is an out-and-out party Liberal; Mr. Gladstone's own man, Major Baring, is a connection of Lord Northbrook's, and owes his place not to any special ability, but to his Whig friends in the Cabinet. Yet even these party men cannot stand by silent and see it done. The rest of the Council is like-minded with them. Thus the only representatives India has, the only people who can officially speak in her name, join with the unheeded Natives in praying that this

iniquitous proposal should be rejected. No wonder ! The case is far stronger every way than that of the Afghan War, strong as that was. Those, then, who are immediately responsible in the East cannot help seeing not only the wrong which will be done, but the mischievous distrust which must inevitably follow. We may impoverish India in well-meaning ignorance ; but we cannot thrust on to her the cost of an imperial war without being aware that we ease our own pockets to her detriment.

But now, apart from the question of India's miserable poverty, which should procure her some consideration, leaving aside the fact that she is a conquered country wholly under our control, overlooking the vehement protest of the Whig, Lord Ripon, and his Council, forgetting for the moment that India has no effective representatives here at home—for what does the Indian Council amount to as a political force?—what sort of war, what manner of conquest, is this for which she is to be called upon to pay ? Only see. Sir, there have been some very curious wars in our history. We of to-day are paying, in the shape of interest on the National Debt, for some monstrous, queer transactions entered into by our governing classes of the past. But, I venture to say, when the truth comes to be written out in full, no more miserable war than this against the Egyptian people will be found inscribed on our records. Say that we ought to have fought at all, why should India pay for our vacillation, incompetence, and extravagance ? And we are not out of the wood yet by any means.

It is said, however, that we went to war to secure the Suez Canal, and that is to some a sufficient reason for the whole bad business. Yet who threatened the Suez Canal ? Not Arabi, that is certain. With every temptation to block it he refrained from touching it. Not the Egyptians, for they are interested in its maintenance as a highway. Men seem to forget that the overland route which preceded the Suez Canal was carried on for years without any difficulty at periods when Egypt was in the gravest trouble and confusion. No, no ! though we have far more interest in the Suez Canal than all other nations on the earth put together, no man who has read the Blue Books can hold that we went to war on that account. The Suez Canal could have been secured without war ; or, if that is a debateable point, let us leave it. Grant, for the sake of argument, that we did attack Egypt to protect the Suez Canal. Still, why should India pay for our conquest ? We, not India, get the profits of the Indian trade to the tune of 30,000,000*l.* a-year, as I have said, without any commercial return to the Natives. It is very well for us to chant the blessings of our rule in chorus, but if we withdraw our army, where

would our rule be? The Suez Canal, after all, is but one of our routes to send armies to maintain our supremacy. There is more in it than this. If others besides ourselves should pay for the protection of the Suez Canal, then beyond all question our wealthy, loyal, prosperous, and increasing colonies in Australia and New Zealand should come largely to our aid. An ever-increasing portion of their most important trade passes through the Canal; their chief postal route lies, and for all time will lie that way. Why does not the Liberal Government call upon them to pay some portion, at least, of the cost of the advantages gained for them and us by our conquest of Egypt? If we are in the right and the Canal is secure, surely our wealthy countrymen beyond the sea would gladly help their brethren at home with a contribution. We know very well they would not; because they were not consulted, if for no other reason. Their representative Assemblies would very closely scrutinize the whole job before they voted a shilling. India, too, was not consulted, yet India may have to pay. In this case, as in many others, the unrepresented are, like the absent, always in the wrong. I contend then, first, that the Suez Canal was not the real reason why we want to war with Arabi; and, secondly, that if it were, India ought no more to be called upon to pay for our war of aggression than our Australian colonies, who have never been applied to at all.

What then remains? Unquestionably that the war, whether intentionally or not, was entered upon in the interests of the bondholders—a most influential body—and they have gained a security which, perhaps, to the benefit of the people of Egypt, they stood a very good chance of losing. This war might fairly be called the moneylenders' campaign. The Oppenheims and Bischoffheims, the Rothschilds, the Barings and the Lawson Levys, Baron de Worms, and the Right Hon. J. G. Goschen—the new Chancellor of the Exchequer, as some say—Sir George Elliott and Sir Julian Goldsmid, these are the main champions of the Egyptian War. This Semitic array and their bottleholders have made a fine thing of it. They have more interest in the war than anybody else, or than the whole English people together. We begin to know nowadays what the phrase spoiling the Egyptians really means. But what has India to do with it all? If these financial gentlemen called the tune, in Heaven's name let them pay the piper. There are no bondholders in India, that's certain. Arabi, whether a plunderer or patriot, took not one farthing out of any Indian purse if he repudiated the entire Egyptian debt. India, as I hold, is not a particle the gainer, because Sir Garnet Wolseley captured Tel-el-Kebir.

Have we then come to such a pass that, like the French in Tunis and Mexico, our external policy is to be guided by a clique of international loanmongers and contractors, that we are to be dragged into a miserable war in order to float the securities of a Baron de Forebails, or to feather the nest of a Sir Judas de Minorities? It looks very much like it. But let us at least take care that if we are willing to allow these gentry to trade upon our own incapacity and folly, we do not try to get the cost of our Jecker Bond business out of a weak, poverty-stricken, defenceless people, who have us alone to look to, and must give way to our demands.

If as Englishmen we need a forcible precedent to strengthen our position, we have one ready to our hand. Early in this century an Indian Expedition was landed in Egypt to co-operate with the forces of Sir Ralph Abercromby against the armies of France. That, too, was an Imperial business that concerned—though not in the same way as now—our political relation and connection with India. Yet England paid every farthing of the cost, and there was no need for protest. The fact, however, is that I have not met a single Englishman who will openly say, I consider it fair, upright and honourable that India should pay for this war. This, without going into the question of Indian poverty or the absence of representation. The point is too clear at first sight. Those same protests from all independent men and independent papers which were heard when Conservatives placed upon India the cost of the Afghan fighting are heard again now. It rests, I trust, with the East India Association to bring the whole of this discontent to a focus, and to force the Government by a cry of public opinion to do justice to our Indian fellow-subjects. The opportunity is a great one, and the cause is good. I, for one, can imagine no higher reward for this body than that it should stand forward as the champion of the interests of 200,000,000 of people in their time of need.

There are two ways of maintaining an empire—even an empire based, as ours in India is, upon conquest and military domination. The one is to trust wholly and solely to the sword, riding roughshod over every moral principle in a brutal consciousness of strength. This can be done, and has been done more than once in the world's history; but even so it calls for constant watchfulness and sacrifice on the part of the dominant race. Who does not wish now that we had listened to Barré and Franklin, Chatham and Washington, before the tea was thrown into Boston harbour, and a mad king and a self-seeking aristocracy persisted in injustice towards a noble people? We lost America through pettifogging injustice and mean class greed. Continue our

present course, and we may lose India in the same way. The other system is to rely upon firmness, justice, and consideration, so that the subject people may see in the connection a free and peaceful outlet for their energies now, and a certainty of self-government and liberty in the near future. India, for the past twenty-four years, has been little more than a pretext for Europeanization, and an outlet for our capital at good rates of interest. Three Imperial wars have been waged, in Abyssinia, in Afghanistan, and now in Egypt. The first we honestly paid for ourselves. The second we allowed to fall upon the shoulders of our over-taxed fellow-subjects. It is for you to urge honesty in the last. The bastard imperialism of Carthage threatens to sap the foundations of our strength even at home. But a nobler alternative lies before us. If in this instance of Egypt Englishmen refuse to allow a Liberal, as they ought to have refused to allow a Conservative Government, to force India to pay for a war of aggression in which she has no real interest, then a first step will have been taken in that path which may yet lead to a reorganization of Indian finance, and a re-establishment of Indian prosperity. But, to end as I began, not from the upper and middle classes who thrive on India's impoverishment can any real assistance be looked for. The appeal must be made over the head of Empress and Aristocrat, Parliament, Cabinet, and caucus, to that great mass of working Englishmen who, in the near future, will have absolute control of the forces of our country, and have no interest save in true justice and good government for the millions who now remain in hopelessness and want.

Mr. W. J. GRAZEBROOK said that, strange to say, he had come to pretty nearly the same conclusion as the lecturer had arrived at, although from a totally different line of thought, and in altogether a different manner. He had asked himself why India should pay for the war in Egypt? He came to the conclusion, in the first place that those who had caused the war should pay for the war. Then, again, there was a second reply to the question, and that was, that those should pay for the war who obtained the benefits of the war. He preferred to treat this last proposition first. With regard to the war he thought it would be admitted that without the possession of India England would not have been justified in going to war with Egypt. (Hear, hear, and "No.") That was a point he was prepared to maintain. With regard to India he contended that the benefits she receives through the existence of the Suez Canal are very great, as by the Canal she has an immediate and direct communication with Western Europe for her produce, and has also the benefit of receiving

English manufactures at greatly reduced cost, owing to the economy of the Canal route and the quicker despatch, that it might be fair to contend that India should pay part of the cost. Clearly India benefits through keeping the Suez Canal open, and looking on the face of the matter, India should in justice contribute to the cost of the war undertaken to keep the Canal open. *If it were not for other and ulterior reasons*, of which by-and-bye, he (the speaker) maintained that as rebellion in Egypt began this war, it would be right and proper for Egypt to pay some share of the cost, and not out of place to expect the bondholders, whose position would be strengthened, also to pay some part of it. As one result of the war the rapacity of the Pashas would be checked, and the fellahs would be able to live in peace and prosperity; it therefore seemed but right to him that Egypt should pay some portion of the cost of the war. But on the other hand questions of high State policy intervened. We have attained a position in consequence of our action in Egypt, which gives us a claim beyond France and other nations, and this we should lose if our expenditure should be repaid. With regard to the real question before the meeting, he wished to ask, "Who caused the war?" He maintained it was caused by the vacillation and weakness of the Government. It was the same vacillation and weakness that gave up Afghanistan; that gave up Candahar—(hear, hear)—and that in the Transvaal gave up, after being beaten three times. (Hear, hear, and dissent.) How could the Khedive believe in a Government who had shown such vacillation? How could Arabi fear a Government or the threats of a Government that had set going and carried out the sham at Dulcigno? Returning to the question as to the payment for the war, Mr. Grazebrook said that although as an abstract principle he held that India ought to pay her share, taking into account the circumstance that the war occurred through the fault of the British Government, we have no right to demand that share from India. Thus for a very different reason he arrived at the same result as the lecturer; but, before sitting down, he wished to controvert a current impression. The Chairman, for instance, had alluded to the cost of the army in India, but he held that as the money was spent in India it was not a loss to India; the money paid to the army thus went back to the people, while the presence of the army kept India in a position of prosperity, stopping insurrection, and by giving security enabled the ryot to work in peace, and preventing those wars which kept down the population and retarded the cultivation of the land. He held that it was beneficial to keep that army there, and to increase rather than diminish it, considering that its cost was not to be compared with the amount of good that resulted from its presence.

RAJAH RAMPAL SINGH said he must frankly own that the force and eloquence of the able lecturer had been such as to convert him from the opinion he originally leant to. At one time he had thought that since the troops of India were brought into the field to fight in common with the soldiers of England, in support of mutual interests, India might not unfairly be asked to meet the cost of her own contingent. But recalling the extreme poverty of India, and the cogency of the arguments marshalled by Mr. Hyndman, he owned himself converted entirely to the opinion that India should be entirely exempt from the charges of the Egyptian Expedition. The domination of England in India was peculiar. It was true, probably, that the Aryan races entered India as a conquering force, but remaining in the country they mingled with the aborigines and became Indians themselves. And so also was it in the case of the in-coming of the Mussulman races. These called up the Hindus to aid in the Government of the country. All offices were open to ability apart from race, and many of the brightest lights of the Mogul Empire were drawn from the supposedly conquered Hindus. How great the contrast afforded by the British polity in India! Under that *regime* all the high and responsible positions are carefully reserved for the conquering race, and the opening of a little gate of promotion here and there in the Civil Service is made the subject of torrents of British self-praise at their vast generosity. The principle thus set up naturally extended from the Government Service to the private and business vocations of life; and hence they found that European merchants and traders grasped the major portion of India's foreign trade, and took the first place in India's commerce. It might be objected, in relation to this question of payment for the war, that if the people of India were poor so also were they poor in England. But it must be remembered that in some most important respects the English people have the power to redress their wrongs. If occasion suggests it, they throw down the railings in Hyde Park or they stone the houses of statesmen; and politicians find it wise to listen to them. Demonstrations like these are not open to the Indian people; they have neither voice nor power in relation to their national affairs. Only one other point would he intrude upon the meeting, and it was this: If, as the British Government said, the object of the "hostilities" was to restore the rule of the Khedive and bring peace, order, and prosperity back to Egypt, why should not the cost be paid by those who benefited by the operation?" (Hear, hear.)

Mr. FRANCIS MATHEW (Bombay) said the paper which they had just heard read treated the important questions brought under

notice with an emotional philanthropy calculated to excite sympathy, which should not, however, be allowed to lead away from a fair consideration of the conditions and circumstances on which only a correct judgment may be formed. In treating the questions presented difficulties arise from speaking of India as a whole—that vast Indian continent which includes so many descriptions and varieties of country and climate, and so many nations which differ from each other in race, in habits, and in language. To speak of India as a whole, as a country which does not produce food sufficient for the inhabitants, he held to be a mistake. As a matter of fact India largely exports grain and seeds and other produce. From Bombay alone, in the past year, over 500,000 tons of food grains were exported, and to the great profit of India; as the cost of inland carriage becomes reduced the exports have increased, and are increasing. India has during many years taken in, absorbed, large quantities of the precious metals, and India must be, under the circumstances, as regards the possession of gold and silver, exceedingly rich. We know, however, that parts of India have suffered grievously in seasons of drought. But history repeats itself. In Joseph's time there was corn in Egypt; and in India there are, so to say, many Egypts. During a dearth in Southern India there was abundance in Northern India. With a season of want in Eastern India we had teeming crops in the Punjab and in Goojerat, and the one want was means of transport. This want has now to some extent been supplied, and is being further provided for by the wise liberality of Government by the use of British capital, which has been obtained at less than half the cost in interest which a Native Government would have had to pay; and yet this great and beneficent measure, by which the Indian people, as far as human means can provide, are being protected against famines, and by which several millions in annual interest on the capital expended have been saved to the Indian people, seems to be treated by Mr. Hyndman as a measure of injustice and extortion. Recent investigations have shown how little we knew a few years ago of the populations and resources of India, and how much we have yet to learn. Sir James Caird, we are told in Mr. Hyndman's paper, estimates the cultivated area of land in India at equal to an acre per head of the population. We have read how, in olden times, in England, "every rood of land maintained its man;" so an acre of cultivated land to every individual man, woman, and child in an Eastern country does not seem to be a poor provision. But Sir James Caird has not told us how greatly production is likely to be increased by the great irrigation works which are now being carried out in the Punjab and in Southern India, nor has he told us of the

acreage in India which produces two or three crops per annum; nor of the vast area uncultivated which feeds flocks and herds which produce the milk, ghee, and butter which form important items in Indian food; nor yet of what may be termed the rich crops of mangoes, plantains, cocoanuts, and other nutritious fruits, which form a great part of the food of the Indian people; neither has he spoken of the food supplied from seas and rivers which afford fish in quantities which to us in this cold climate, without special knowledge, it would be difficult to realize. He (Mr. Mathew) had lived in India many years, and travelled in most parts of the Continent; he had camped month after month in districts, towns, and villages; and he had, in all places and in all seasons, observed, as a rule, the simple, frugal, and joyous existence of the people. A casual visitor may easily be misled or mistaken; but he could only say, as the result of his observations and experience, that, in his belief, the labouring classes in India have more enjoyment in life, and suffer in ordinary and usual circumstances far less privation and hardship than the labouring classes in this country. He liked the people of India. He had been associated with many of the higher classes in the districts, in the Bombay Royal Asiatic Society, and in the municipality and the university of Bombay, and he heartily sympathized in their legitimate aspirations, in which he included an extension of local self-government, a real representation in the Indian Legislative Councils, and in the Imperial Parliament. When we have such a representation, he felt sure that, instead of exaggerated and sensational stories of alleged misgovernment and misuse of power by junior officials, we shall have a recognition of the liberal, fair, and generous spirit in which Great Britain desires to rule her great dependency. Then, he felt sure that the chosen and responsible members for India will not see fit to put forward a plea of poverty on the part of India as an excuse to evade contributing a fair share towards the Imperial expenditure; and the people of India will agree the more readily with the knowledge that, when their time of strait or difficulty comes, the strong arm of the Imperial Power will always be readily extended to perform the first duty of Government, and to protect the lives and the rights and liberties of British subjects in India, as in every other part of the Empire.

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY said that, with the exception of two points, he agreed with the whole of the paper which had been read, and the Association was much indebted to Mr. Hyndman for having put into such good language the views which the Association

would wish to place before the country as to the iniquity and impolicy of saddling the people of India with the cost of the military operations in Egypt. One point to which he wished to take exception was that he thought the author of the paper had been too precipitate in doubting Mr. Fawcett's adherence to his honourable past and to his former speeches. When Lord Hartington spoke it was not then necessary for Mr. Fawcett to have spoken, as the Government had not then made up their minds, and Mr. Fawcett's recent speech to his constituents implied that, if Government persisted in putting the cost of the Indian Contingent in Egypt on India, he would then oppose it. In that case, if he did not free himself so as to be able to speak out, it would be time to apply to him the criticism which had been applied to him to-day. Another point was that Mr. Hyndman appeared to have forgotten his Roman history, and the fable which was related to the discontented Romans of "the belly and the members," when he endeavoured to separate the interest of the lower classes in India from that of the upper and middle classes. It was not possible to divide the nation or its interests in that way. If we lost India, the working classes would be the first to suffer from it; and when the India Office obliged the Indian Government to sacrifice revenue by reducing the cotton duties, this was done for the sake of the votes and the interests of the Manchester working men, and not for a few manufacturers. But Mr. Hyndman's conclusion was perfectly right that the Association should address itself to the constituencies, for it was owing to their indifference that members of Parliament took so little interest in India. The India Office might think that some of the language of the paper which had been read was too strong, but it was necessary that our rulers should be aroused out of their fool's paradise and false security as to India, the peace of which was endangered if such injustices were done.

Mr. S. B. BROACHA said he had heard the paper read with unmixed satisfaction. He was sure that all were of one opinion—whether they assented to or dissented from Mr. Hyndman's views—that they are the views of a singularly able, sincere, and earnest man, very clearly and forcibly expressed. (Hear, hear.) They had all known Mr. Hyndman in India by reputation. This was not the first debt of gratitude, nor, it is to be hoped, the last that that country will owe to him. They all remembered his celebrated article with that flaming heading, "The Bankruptcy of India," and it is now the opinion, both of those who accepted his views and of those who rejected them, that the singularly vivid and glowing colours in which

he drew the picture of the deplorable condition of the finances of India, were mainly instrumental in rousing the attention of the people of this country to the state of affairs there. Of course the attention was short-lived and spasmodic, as usual. It is the growing opinion of his (Mr. Broacha's) countrymen that nothing short of a rebellion or a great political conspiracy—perhaps a frontier war, or an agrarian disturbance—would direct the attention of the people of this country to that small and distant portion of Her Majesty's Empire called India, with a population only eight times as numerous as that of the British Isles. But whatever there are of subsequent retrenchments, economies, and reforms in the finances of India, they will be not a little owing to what some are pleased to call Mr. Hyndman's "sensational" article. It is to be hoped that the present paper may meet with the same good luck. It is to be hoped that it may rouse the people of this country into an examination of its national conscience as to the justice of saddling India with a portion of the Egyptian war cost. It is to be hoped that it may lead the Liberal leaders to an introspection of themselves, and to compare their impending action in office to their philanthropic philippics thundered on the wrongs of India when out of office, in a time of what their great leader was pleased to call "of greater freedom and less responsibility." (Laughter, and hear, hear.) Nobody in India believed—they in this country did not believe until the Marquis of Hartington rose in his place in Parliament to announce, and Mr. Gladstone followed him to explain away some of his former writings—that the great Liberal party, through the mouths of its leaders, would ask, or rather compel, for requests were seldom preferred to that country, but commands always thundered on her—India to pay a portion of the war charges. They did not believe that the great statesman who, when out of office, wrote and spoke that India has been unjustly dealt with in the matter of some of the home charges, and who contended that this country ought to bear a portion of the army charges annually paid by India, would now come forward to saddle India with a portion of the cost, ignoring the fact that the regular chain of causes that brought on the war had nothing to do with India. To his mind the causes of the war are clear and few. It is true that since the Revolutionary wars this country has been more or less averse to interfering in the internal affairs of foreign countries. This country did not wish to interfere in the internal affairs of Egypt. But then, also, she did not wish that any other Power should interfere in the internal affairs of Egypt, or to have a greater and preponderating influence there. France had vast financial interests in Egypt, and the French Government was

bent on interfering in the affairs of Egypt in the interests of the French bondholders and French capitalists. Well, there were two alternatives open to this country. One was straightforward and British; the other crooked and un-British. The one was to stand sentinel and cry "Hands Off!" without caring for French ill-will; the other was to make a joint intervention to save the so-called French Alliance. The crooked alternative was chosen. (Hear, hear.) The successive financial missions, ending in the Control, were the outcome of the joint interference. To maintain the Control and its despotism they had Ishmael dethroned, and Tewfik put in his place. To maintain the Control and Tewfik they quarrelled with the National party, and rejected their demand of having a share in the management of the finances of the nation. That demand was most just—it was the unalienable right of every people that no treaties, no negotiations, or no despot, could barter away. Yet the demand was within a very moderate compass. It did not extend to the appropriations assigned over to the bondholders. The subsequent stages that precipitated the bombardment of Alexandria, and culminated into war, were not a little brought about by the mendacity of the agents of the bondholders and "Our Own" excited "Correspondents." According to those veracious Tacituses, who never gave an opinion without making protestations of their impartiality and infallibility, were it not for the benign presence of foreigners in Egypt, the Egyptians would have starved. It is, perhaps, one reason why the foreigners were not taxed. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) It was a wonder it was not asserted that the Nile would have ceased to flow in the land, or that she would have diverted her course southward. (Hear, hear.) According to these same authorities not one in a hundred thousand Egyptians thinks; or there are not fifty thinking beings in the land of Rameses, in the land of Pharaohs, Ptolemies, and the pyramids! Yet every one of these fellahs believes in the unity of God, and has faith in the merciful dispensations of His providence that will, sooner or later, relieve them from the oppressions and injustice of foreigners, who are not Englishmen but Levantines—the southern blood-suckers. (Hear, hear.) These are the open causes of the war that no arguments or ambiguities can obscure. India has nothing whatsoever to do with these transactions. (Hear, hear.) India holds no Egyptian Bonds: she has no commercial or financial interests with Egypt. Can the same be said of this country? (Hear, hear.) India, or Indian authorities, were never consulted throughout these transactions that have ended so deplorably. The question is often asked, "Should we have bought the Suez Canal Shares were it not for India?" Yes. They could not

have helped buying to have a voice in the management and toll of a thoroughfare on which the traffic passing is more than three-fourths British. But the Suez Canal was never in danger. (Hear, hear, and dissent.) Even in the death-throes of invasion the Nationalists did not touch it; for they knew that the heavy hand of all Europe was committed to its safety. But if the Suez Canal was ever in danger it was the effect and, not the cause of, the war. But, granting for a moment the Suez Canal as the cause of the war, then let these portions of the Empire interested in its safety pay for the war. (Hear, hear.) The portions interested are the British Isles, India, and Australia. Will Australia share with India the cost of the Contingent? No. India will be compelled to pay, because she is weak and cannot resist. Australia will not be even asked, because they know she will refuse and cannot be forced. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. ROPER LETHBRIDGE, C.I.E. (late Press Commissioner of India), said that, whilst heartily agreeing with the conclusion so ably and forcibly insisted on by Mr. Hyndman, he desired to explain that he arrived at the conclusion by a line of thought altogether divergent from the line followed in the lecture to which they had been listening. Mr. Hyndman had dwelt on the poverty of India, and virtually asked for generous treatment from England on that ground. It was unnecessary to point out that no permanent arrangement can subsist between two Governments, however close may be the ties binding them together, that depends on considerations of poverty on the one side, or generosity on the other. Nor does India make any such *ad misericordiam* appeal. But she asks for *justice*; and it is for us to help her to get it. They were all familiar with the apologue of the Giant and the Dwarf who went forth to fight in company, and agreed, on somewhat vague terms, to share the risks of war. They would all, without distinction of party, acknowledge the justice of its teaching in the case before them that afternoon, that it is very necessary we should have a definite, an *inelastic*, rule laid down for the apportionment of military burdens between the giant in political strength—England—and that political dwarf—India. If each member of the British Imperial Federation had an equal voice in the decision of every question of peace and war there would be less difficulty about effecting a satisfactory arrangement; for each would then be equitably called upon to contribute its fixed allotment in every case. But the supremacy of the representatives of the English taxpayers, under present circumstances, deprives such an arrangement of its equitable character; whilst our relations with the Colonies put it, he feared, out

of the range of practical politics. For practical purposes, then, it has been agreed that this rule shall be binding on the consciences of the English taxpayers—that England shall pay for English wars; India for Indian wars. But the question immediately arises, “What wars are English: What Indian?” (Hear, hear.) At the time of the Afghan War the then Opposition maintained that England was partially responsible for the war, on the ground that English interests were directly affected. But English interests are affected by every attack on India; and Indian interests are affected by every attack on England. And if *that* is to be the only criterion of financial responsibility, it is clear that there will always be room for any amount of differences of opinion as to the boundaries of English and Indian interests respectively. We have recently seen the very same statesmen, who, only two or three years ago, insisted upon the joint responsibility of England for a war on the frontier of the Punjaub, now imposing on India the joint responsibility for a war on the shores of the Mediterranean and on the highway to our Australian colonies. And, indeed, with such an elastic rule, it must soon come to pass that, *in every case*, the party in power in England will have the strongest incentives to throw as much of the burden as possible on India; whilst the Opposition, in order to secure justice for India, will have the invidious task of dwelling on the unfair conduct of their own countrymen—thereby running the risk of undermining the loyalty and inflaming the passions of our Indian fellow-subjects. He was very sure there was no one in that room who would not heartily deprecate such a deplorable state of things. He ventured to think that it is a matter of the highest importance that the English nation should settle, once for all, and, probably by a Legislative Enactment, what wars are to be regarded as Indian wars, and to be chargeable on the Indian revenues. Lord Hartington admitted in the debate on this subject, in the House of Commons, that it is practically impossible to draw a hard-and-fast line between wars affecting English interests and wars affecting Indian interests. And, yet, unless we can get a hard-and-fast line of some sort, it is quite certain, after our experience of the Afghan and Egyptian Wars, that the Government and the Opposition will usually quarrel over the apportionment of the charges. It is clear, then, that the notions put forward by the Liberal Opposition at the time of the Afghan War that we can make the question “Whose interests are involved?” the criterion of financial responsibility is an utterly untenable one—for it can only result in the most deplorable dissensions, and in gross injustice to India. Now it seemed to him perfectly obvious that the only fair and decisive

criterion of financial responsibility is to be found in diplomatic responsibility. Tell him who caused the war, or who failed to avert it, and he would tell them who ought to pay for it. (Hear, hear.) This, it seemed to him, was the criterion rightly adopted by Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Lytton—"Oh," and hear, hear)—and, in addition to its fairness, it has the advantage of being geographically exact; so that, if the principle be once generally admitted, there can be no doubts about its application to any particular case. War must always be preceded by diplomacy. If that diplomacy has been in the hands and under the control of the Indian Government, as in the case of the Afghan War, India will not complain if she has to enforce the demands, or pay for the failures of *her own* statesmen. But if the Indian Government has had *no voice whatever* in the matter, as in this Egyptian War; if, perchance, war has been brought about by the vacillation of an English statesman, or by the general belief that an English Ministry would under no circumstances go to war, or by the angry passions of an English vested interest, or by any other cause over which India has had no control, and in regard to which the Indian Viceroy had not issued a single order—then, he thought, for us to impose any part of the burden on the unrepresented millions of India, is to use our giant's strength with a giant's brutality. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. W. MARTIN WOOD, after referring to the interest and variety of the topics raised by preceding speakers, observed that Mr. Roper Lethbridge's proposal to fix the responsibility on England or on India for the cost of wars by Indian forces upon the basis of diplomatic origin of such wars gave little hope of practical improvement. Though stated with lucidity by Mr. Lethbridge just now, that method had, indeed, proved illusory and vague. The only proper principle, although apparently overlooked by Mr. Lethbridge and grievously disregarded by the late Government, had really been long since clearly laid down. In the Act of 1858, which transferred the rule of the Company to the Crown, plain and unmistakable language is used which no one ventured to dispute until the last Afghan War, originated by British diplomacy, by Lord Salisbury's direction, under the Viceroyalty of Lord Lytton. Section 55 of that Act provides that "Except for preventing
" or repelling actual invasion of Her Majesty's Indian possessions, or
" under other urgent and sudden necessity, the revenues of India shall
" not, without the consent of the both Houses of Parliament, be applic-
" able to defray the expenses of any military operation carried on
" beyond the external frontiers of such possessions by Her Majesty's

“ forces charged upon such revenues.” The next section of the Act goes on to say : “ The Military and Naval Forces of the East India Company shall be deemed to be the Indian Military and Naval Forces of Her Majesty, and shall be under the same obligations to serve Her Majesty as they would have been under to serve the said Company and shall be liable to serve *within the same territorial limits only* for the same terms only,” &c., &c. Nothing could be more distinct than this ; and the same principle runs through the Parliamentary history of that statute. The reason is obvious—the Indian and British Treasuries are entirely separate. England never has paid, and does not pay anything whatever, in any shape for the maintenance of the Indian system. On the other hand, India largely supports—indirectly, but not the less really—the British military system. This is one reason and a sufficient one even if none others existed, why India should not be called upon to pay the cost of ministering to the Imperial policy of the British Government in Egypt or anywhere else. India sustains the whole cost of her British garrison, and also of the training in this country required to keep it up ; and thus India maintains for England a large and highly efficient army which can be, and is, called beyond the confines of India, as required by the Home Government. India, in fact, pays for what is the military reserve of England, and thus provides a picked, choice, and efficient force always more or less available. These facts were a sufficient reply to Mr. Grazebrook’s argument regarding the “ obligations ” of India to us—obligations which would justify, as that speaker seemed to think, the calling upon the people of India to pay a share of the cost of the Egyptian Expedition. Mr. Hyndman had well and aptly alluded to the provisions of Stuart Mill and his able vindication of the East India Company’s Directorate. The records of the great Company show that, over and over again, the Directors manfully resisted the attempts to impose the cost of Imperial military operations upon the revenues of the Company, or, in other words, upon the Indian people. As Mr. Hyndman had pointed out, the Directorate of the East India Company were unjustly held responsible for measures directed by the Secret Committee of the Board of Control, as in the case of the first Afghan War and numerous other extravagancies which have gone to swell the present Indian National Debt. Mr. Wood added that at so late an hour he would not venture to further enlarge upon Mr. Hyndman’s able address. He was not aware whether it would be deemed advisable to concentrate the opinion of the meeting in the form of a resolution ; but, by way of showing how this might be done he read the following draft of such resolution :—

“ I. That this meeting considers the proposal to make India sustain

“ the expenses of the Contingent withdrawn from her garrison for
“ service in Egypt is unfair. Because (a) India defrays the total cost,
“ both in India and England, of the military charges connected with
“ her defence ; (b) because her responsible authorities had nothing to
“ do with the policy and objects that led up to that war ; and, (c)
“ because the war could, only in a remote and constructive sense,
“ have any relation to Indian interest and defence. II. That to
“ impose this charge on India would be unconstitutional and opposed
“ not only to the general tenour of the Act of 1858, but in flagrant
“ violation of Sections 55 and 56 of that Act. III. That for the
“ British Government to adopt the policy of indenting on the Indian
“ garrison for troops to aid in carrying out or supporting the measures
“ of the Cabinet for the time being would render it impossible for the
“ Indian Government even to reduce its present heavy military
“ charges.” (Applause.) Mr. Wood said he could leave it to the
Chairman and the meeting to say if such a resolution should be put.

Dr. G. B. CLARKE said he would be glad to second the motion moved by Mr. Martin Wood, if it were only to the effect that the proposal to pay the expenses of the Indian Contingent out of Indian funds is unjust and impolitic ; and, if that was all the motion implied, he agreed with it. With regard to the paper, he thought Mr. Hyndman might congratulate himself on the fact that his main contentions and proposals had met with very little opposition. The meeting had heard from Mr. Mathew a very general defence of our rule in India, and that gentleman had adduced certain statements with reference to the export of grain from India. And, although that was away from the present question, it was well to say, that, although we export grain from Bombay and Calcutta, the fact remains that the soil of India is deteriorating, and the condition of the population as a whole is not improving. Looking only at the cities, it might be said that India is flourishing, but if you go into the villages the condition is altogether different. He (the speaker) spent six months in India in 1876 and 1877, and saw, while in Madras, millions suffering from starvation, and dying from it. Why did they die? From Mr. Mathew's standpoint it was from want of methods of conveyance ; but in his (the speaker's) opinion, it was because taxation was so heavy that the people could not keep for the bad years any surplus remaining from the good years, because of the back rents extorted by the Government. That, however, was not the question. It was whether India should pay part of the cost of the war. Mr. Mathew said “ Yes ;” but even Mr. Grazebrook, whose arguments

seemed to favour the view of making India pay, finally admitted India ought not to pay. This gentleman (Mr. Grazebrook) told us some curious things. He seemed to know not only the secrets of Arabi but also the secrets of the Cabinet, as he stated that if it had not been for India we should not have gone to war at all. The ostensible reason put forward for the war was that Egypt has been suffering from a military despotism, and it was our object to relieve them of it. Well! we have done so. The Pashas are in prison; the army has been disbanded; -and yet the Egyptian people hate us more than ever, and if our troops were removed the Government we have set up would at once be overturned, as it rests only on our bayonets. We now find that the national party, the party whom Arabi claimed to act for, represents all sections of the people. This fact is not quite in accord with the statements made before the war. The speaker to whom he had already referred had said that the Egyptians began the war. Of course the bombardment of the forts of Alexandria was only an act of defence against an attack made upon us. He remembered Lord Salisbury being criticised severely for having said the Zulus began the Zulu War: the Zulus began in the same way as the Egyptians.

Mr. GRAZEBROOK here rose to order, and said Dr. Clarke had misrepresented him. We went to Egypt to defend the Khedive against his rebellious subjects. That was what he meant, and what he believed he stated.

Dr. CLARKE, resuming, referred to a despatch to Sir E. Malet, dated January 10, 1882, in which Lord Granville said that Sir E. Malet was to oppose the granting of power to vote the Budget in consequence of the financial affairs which were in our hands, and on behalf of which we were acting. Sir E. Malet, in a despatch a week after this, said: "Armed intervention will be necessary if we continue in our refusal to allow the Chamber to vote the Budget." This clearly proved the cause of the war. Armed intervention has been used to prevent the Egyptian Chamber having any control over its Budget. This being so, he (the speaker) quite agreed with what Mr. Hyndman had said. He believed this was the most disgraceful war of modern times: a war made for the purpose of maintaining bondholders and placeholders. (Hear, hear, and "No.") Lord Granville's despatch proved the true cause, and the other reasons had been manufactured since. The Blue Books showed that our interference was on account of pecuniary interests. If this were the case, why should India pay for a war which was entirely in the interest of our bondholders

and placeholders? The fellahs had risen in Egypt against intolerable taxation and tyranny, and it seemed to him that we, by further taxing India, would raise the flame of rebellion among the ryots in India for just the same reasons that had operated in Egypt. ("No.") He (the speaker) had travelled through all parts of India, and could say that he saw nothing in English government to produce the impression that we are benefactors; indeed, when he was in the North-West Provinces and saw the Native states and their government, he came to the conclusion that we are doing nothing in India but what India can do for itself under Native control, because the people appeared to be more prosperous and comfortable under Indian management than where they are under European management.

MIRZA PEER BUKHSH said he would offer only a very few words, as a lengthened illness prevented his attempting anything more. But he could not resist the duty of expressing, as a native of India, his thanks to Mr. Hyndman for his most able presentment of the cause of the Indian people. He only wished that the English people could be brought to see the political atrocities committed in their name. What reason had the British Government to go and fight with Arabi? What Arabi had done, and was doing, was only what the English people lauded in the patriots whose careers were written in history. There were Englishmen who went a good deal further than Arabi, and beheaded an inconvenient king, in 1649, and the French people followed the example a century and a half later, in 1793. (Hear, hear.) The fact was that the British and other European officials did not like popular demonstrations of feeling any more than they like them in India; and they knew only one way to stop them—the use of the strong hand—and they advised the Ministers at home accordingly. Wherein were the Egyptians to blame? They were said to be repairing or strengthening the forts at Alexandria. Well, why not? (Hear, hear.) Was that a reason why on the flimsy pretext of "self-defence" a city should be bombarded, on July 11, and vast destruction wrought? Anyhow, it was monstrous to impose upon India the cost of so peculiar a demonstration of British justice as had been furnished in the campaign. India already had to remit 15,300,000*l.* to England to pay for military forces, pensions, &c., and now it was proposed to ask her to send 2,500,000*l.* more. This was to be extorted from a people, the majority of whom live on less than a halfpenny a day! He must solemnly repeat what he had often said before, that if England wished to keep India loyal and contented, common justice must be extended to the 250,000,000 of people therein, and the

constant aim should be to train up the Indian communities into free political life and the business of governing themselves. This was of all the more importance when it was seen that the vista of difficulties was increasing for England. The Egyptian business was by no means closed. (Hear, hear.) Great responsibilities had been undertaken in connection with Asia Minor; and the hunger of the other European Governments had been aroused. England's house should therefore be kept in order. (Hear, hear.)

The CHAIRMAN said he would be very sorry to be the first to introduce the *clôture* into the East India Association, but as the hour was late and there was a great pressure of speakers, he would ask those who spoke hereafter to be as brief as they consistently could. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. GEORGE FOGGO (who, on rising, was received with cheers) said that, in answer to the Chairman's appeal, he would detain the meeting barely two minutes. He desired to put two points to the lecturer, first, as to the title of his paper: and, second, as to the responsibility of the war. Now, although Mr. Hyndman appeared to think that there was no doubt whatever who should, in justice, pay for the cost of the war, others, like himself, thought the problem one of considerable difficulty. (Hear, hear.) He (Mr. Foggo) came to the meeting undecided, and he was still undecided after all that he had heard there. Now, however much those present might differ on this point, he was sure they would all agree that it was essential, in order to arrive at a sound judgment, that the case—indictment he might call it—should be fairly, and if possible, impartially stated. Mr. Hyndman asks the question, "Why should India pay for the Conquest of Egypt?" Now, was it fair to call it a conquest? Was Egypt a conquered country? Would it not be more correct to style it a temporary military occupation of the country for a special purpose? Then, again, is it absolutely certain, or can further proof be given, that the war was undertaken in the interests or at the instigation of the Egyptian bondholders, for, if such really were the fact, then the answer to the question, "Who is to pay?" should in fairness be, "Neither India nor England, but the Egyptian bondholders, pure and simple." That was all with which he had to trouble the meeting.

Mr. HERBERT BURROWS wished to put before the meeting the English working man's view, as far as he had one. He had lived twenty years among them, and claimed to know something of their

opinions. Two points in the general discussion he would first refer to: one, as to the poverty of India. He gathered that Mr. Hyndman did not base his contention solely on the poverty of that country. If it were unjust to make India pay, whether poor or rich, he was not prepared to say that India is too poor to pay. No doubt wealth is unequally distributed in that country as in this, Europeans taking the lion's share. One speaker had spoken of England and India as a federation, but the essence of a federation is equal State rights. He asked, Was this so with England and India? Federation meant "bear one another's burdens;" but what we are proposing is to make India bear our burdens as well as her own. With regard to the immediate question he asked those who had spoken if there had been no bondholders and no Egyptian debt, would there have been any Egyptian War? ("No," and "Yes.") He did not think there would have been. He regretted that on the question of India and Indian policy working men were generally ignorant; and ignorance, always bad, was in this case especially bad, because with a knowledge of the facts the working men might exercise an influence against those who rule in the interests of the upper and middle classes. England's opinion on most great questions was divided into two camps, the same as Egypt was divided into two camps; in one being gathered the Egyptian people, while in the other was the Khedive. England, too, was divided similarly. In one camp were the upper and middle classes, and the other contained the mass of the people. The result of this division had been that in India the pagoda-tree had been shaken for the benefit of the upper classes; and when working men thought about India at all this was their main idea. Why then not drop cant and boldly acknowledge that we rule India for the advantage of the English privileged classes, as we rule Ireland for the same purpose? (Dissent.) Mr. Chamberlain had said that if we were to withdraw our force from Ireland there would be a revolution in twenty-four hours, and he (the speaker) believed the same might be said of India. ("No.") As the result of this the English race was deteriorating there. ("Question" and "Time.") If the Association wished to do any good in regard to India, he suggested that it should indoctrinate the working-classes with information about India; and he asked, "Why not call a people's meeting at Exeter Hall, or St. James's Hall, and have a thoroughly free discussion of the question?" Before sitting down, Mr. Burrows said he could not but recall Mr. Gladstone's words in reference to the Afghan War, "National dishonour is the surest road to national downfall."

The CHAIRMAN proceeded to put the resolution moved by Mr. Wood and seconded by Dr. Clarke, in the brief form expressing that "In the opinion of this meeting the proposal to compel the people of India to pay the expenses of the Indian Contingent is impolitic and unjust."

But Mr. C. W. ARATHOON and Mr. W. TAYLER (members of Council) both rose and pointed out that it was unusual to take a vote without prior consultation of the Council of the Association, and that many who were present had left not anticipating that a vote would be taken.

The CHAIRMAN at this said he was not cognisant of the custom of the Association, but, it having been explained, he would not put the resolution.

Mr. H. M. HYNDMAN, in replying on the debate, observed that much had been said which could not touch the main point of the paper. But to the questions of Mr. Foggo he would return a direct answer. First, as to the title being an improper one. It distinctly was the case that the Egyptians had been conquered; and thus it was a conquest of Egypt. (A voice, "No, it's not war at all.") "Well" replied Mr. Hyndman, "if it's not war at all I must be content to leave the matter as it is; I will not attempt to answer further." Then, as to the question whether the bondholders should pay. He had already distinctly suggested his views on that head. That the cause of the war was a financial one was shown by Lord Granville's despatch which had been quoted, and he said, "Let those who called the tune pay the piper," and he would even appropriate their bonds or anything that could be got at. (Hear, hear.) He was ready to agitate in that direction; and the more they took the better should he be pleased. With regard to the remarks about the trade of India he was disposed to apply the same remark that was used about Ireland 200 years ago, that though her exports exceed her imports yet she groweth poor to a paradox; for trade was taking out of India so much without returning an equivalent for it. Corn was actually taken out of the country at the time when people were dying of famine. Some gentleman in the audience denied this, and Mr. Hyndman proceeded to reassert the statement, adding that it was at Kurrachee where the shipment took place. Another assertion made was that India was not poor. Every Indian Minister of Finance and all Indian Secre-

taries he could refer to in proof of the contrary. Mr. Hyndman resumed his seat.

Mr. MARTIN WOOD (on behalf of the Council) moved a vote of thanks to the Chairman.

Mr. C. W. ARATHOON seconded this, and the motion was carried unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN, in responding, said that he was struck with the interest taken in the debate. It was asserted that we in England do not care sufficiently about India. There were many English gentlemen present, and he did not remember ever being in an assembly in which Indian subjects aroused such exciting interest. English gentlemen representing all classes of society had spoken, and every one was animated with that noble desire to benefit India, which he trusted would be the guarantee of a genuine effort to improve the condition of India.

Mr. JOHN SHAW moved that the thanks of the meeting be given to Mr. Hyndman for his Paper, which had had the effect of eliciting such an excellent discussion.

Mr. WILLIAM TAYLER (ex-Commissioner of Patna) seconded the motion, which was put and carried unanimously.

Mr. HYNDMAN, in response, said that while it was clear there were differences of opinion, it was also obvious that all present were desirous of doing the best they could for our great dependency.

The meeting then terminated.

**LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE
EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION.**

No.	Name.	Address.
1.	Anundrao Sukaram Burvey, Esq.	Bombay.
2.	Rao Saheb Allumul Trikumdas.	Kurranchi.
3.	Ardaseer Nusserwanjee Mody, Esq.	Bombay.
4.	Ardaseer Framjee, Esq.	Bombay.
5.	Abbajee Vishnoo Kathawaite, Esq.	Ahmedabad.
6.	Ardaseer Bazonjee Vakeel, Esq.	Bombay.
7.	Dr. Ardaseer Pestonjee Cama, L.M.S.	Bombay.
8.	Ardaseer Dadabhai Dadysett, Esq.	Bombay.
9.	Bala Mungesh Wagle.	Bombay.
10.	Balajee Gungudhur, Esq.	Sattara.
11.	Bazonjee Shapoorjee Madon, Esq.	Bombay.
12.	Bhaishunker Nanabhai, Esq.	Bombay.
13.	Bhaskier Hurry Bhagwat, Esq.	Bombay.
14.	Bhikhajee Naorojee Fallonjee, Esq.	Bombay.
15.	Bomonjee Muncherjee Punthakey, Esq.	Bombay.
16.	The Hon'ble Badroodin Tayabjee.	Bombay.
17.	Bomonjee Byramjee Patell, Esq.	Bombay.
18.	Bomonjee Cursetjee Punthakey, Esq.	Bombay.
19.	Byramjee Merwanjee Mulbari, Esq.	Bombay.
20.	Balkristna V. N. Kirtiker, Esq.	Bombay.
21.	Bapoojee Hormusjee Mody, Esq.	Bombay.
22.	Burjorjee Rustomjee Mody, Esq.	Bombay.
23.	Surgeon B. N. Koyajee, Esq.	Surat.
24.	Bulwant Narayen Joshi, Esq.	Kohlapur.
25.	Khan Bahadoor Cursetjee Rustomjee Tannawalla.	Baroda.
26.	Cursetjee Manekjee Sett, Esq.	Bombay.
27.	Cursetjee Sorabjee Seth, Esq.	Bombay.
28.	Cooverjee Cowasjee Jassawalla, Esq.	Bombay.
29.	Cowasjee Eduljee Khumbatta, Esq.	Bombay.
30.	Rao Saheb Chitamon Narayen Bhat.	Tanna.
31.	Chintamon Narayen Kurandiker, Esq.	Tanna.
32.	Dinanath Vishnoo, Esq.	Bombay.
33.	Dadabhai Naorojee Mody, Esq.	Bombay.
34.	Dadabhai Bomonjee Jeejeebhai, Esq.	Bombay.
35.	Dinanath Rughoonath Khote, Esq.	Bombay.
36.	Darasha Sorabjee Taraporewalla, Esq.	Bombay.
37.	Dastoor Jamasjee Minocherjee.	Bombay.
38.	Dinsha Eduljee Wacha, Esq.	Bombay.
39.	Dorabjee Nanabhai Wadia, Esq.	Bombay.
40.	Dorabjee Dhunjeebhai Shroff, Esq.	Bombay.
41.	Dinshaw Pestonjee Kanga, Esq.	Bombay.
42.	Dorabjee Cursetjee Shroff, Esq.	Bombay.
43.	Dayabhai Jadooram, Esq.	Bombay.
44.	Dorabjee Framjee Panday, Esq.	Bombay.
45.	Dadabhai Merwanjee Seth, Esq.	Bombay.
46.	Dossabhai Nusserwanjee Wadia, Esq.	Bombay.
47.	Dinshaw Naorojee Belgamwalla, Esq.	Bombay.
48.	Daji Abbaji Kharé, Esq.	Bombay.
49.	Dayaram Gidumul, Esq.	Kurranchi
50.	Dorabjee Eduljee Gimi, Esq.	Rajkote.
51.	Darashaw Dossabhai, Esq.	Surat.
52.	Dinker Balal Chukradeo, Esq.	Sholapur

No.	Name.	Address.
53.	Dwarkanath Raghoba Turkhudker, Esq.	Scinde, Hydrabad.
54.	Dr. Eduljee Nusserwanjee, G.G.M.C.	Bombay.
55.	Eduljee Rustomjee Reporter, Esq.	Bombay.
56.	Eduljee Bomonjee Morris, Esq.	Bombay.
57.	Eduljee Dorabjee Talatee, Esq.	Kurranchi.
58.	Framjee Dinshaw Petit, Esq.	Bombay.
59.	Framjee Eduljee Davar, Esq.	Bombay.
60.	Dr. Framjee Shapoorjee, G.G.M.C.	Bombay.
61.	Gokuldas Kabandas Parukh, Esq.	Bombay.
62.	Dr. Gopal Shivram, Esq.	Bombay.
63.	Govind Withul Kurkure, Esq.	Bombay.
64.	Gopal Babajee Heerpatuk, Esq.	Nassick.
65.	Gopal Raojee Tilak, Esq.	Kurud.
66.	Rao Sabeel Gopal Govind Ghate.	Kotri.
67.	Gungadhur Pandurang Gadre, Esq.	Kohlapur.
68.	Gokuldas Jugmohundas, Esq.	Bombay.
69.	Hormusjee Cursetjee Bhandoopwalla, Esq.	Bombay.
70.	Hormusjee Cursetjee Doobash, Esq.	Bombay.
71.	Heerjeebhai Ardaseer Cursetjee Dadysett, Esq.	Bombay.
72.	Hormusjee Nusserwanjee Ghista, Esq.	Bombay.
73.	Dr. Hormusjee Dossabhai Pesikaka.	Bombay.
74.	Hurrae Bapoobhai Desai, Esq.	Gundevi.
75.	Janardhun Sukaram Gadgil, Esq.	Baroda.
76.	Jamsetjee Nusserwanjee Tata, Esq.	Bombay.
77.	Jehangir Rustomjee Mody, Esq.	Bombay.
78.	Jamsetjee Nusserwanjee Petit, Esq.	Bombay.
79.	Jehangir Hormusjee, Esq.	Bombay.
80.	Jamsetjee Nusserwanjee Dady, Esq., M.I.C.E.	Bombay.
81.	Jamsetjee Ardaseer Dalal, Esq., M.A.	Bombay.
82.	Jamsetjee Pestonjee Ponchajee, Esq.	Bombay.
83.	Jehangir Maneekjee Cursetjee, Esq.	Bombay.
84.	Khunderao Chimonrao Bedarker, Esq.	Bombay.
85.	Kristnarao Anunta Chimorker, Esq.	Bombay.
86.	Kaikhoshro Naorojee Kabrajee, Esq.	Bombay.
87.	Kavasjee Merwanjee Shroff, Esq.	Bombay.
88.	Kavasjee Dadabhai Naegamwalla, Esq.	Bombay.
89.	Surgeon K. S. Nariman.	Dahod.
90.	Khundoobhai Goolabbhai Desai, Esq.	Karwar.
91.	K. Shamrao Vithul, Esq.	Bombay.
92.	Laloobhai Keshavlal, Esq.	Surat.
93.	Liladhur Jaiam Naronjee, Esq.	Bombay.
94.	Lilaram Watanmul Lalwani, Esq.	Scinde, Hydrabad.
95.	Rao Bahadoor Mahadeo Govind Ranade.	Poona.
96.	Mansookhram Soorajram, Esq.	Bombay.
97.	Morlidhur Girdhar, Esq.	Bombay.
98.	Khan Bahadoor Meershamut Ali	Dewas.
99.	Muncherjee Dossabhai Cama, Esq.	Bombay.
100.	Mooljee Bhawanidas Barbhaya, Esq.	Bombay.
101.	Mansookhlal Moogatlal Moonshi, Esq.	Bombay.
102.	Manekshaw Jehangirshaw, Esq.	Bombay.
103.	Manekshaw Kavasshaw Talegarkhan, Esq.	Bombay.
104.	Muncherjee Bomonjee Punthakey, Esq.	Bombay.

No.	Name.	Address.
105.	Rao Bahadoor Mahadeo Warsodeo Burvey.	Kohlapur.
106.	Meer Gul Husein, Esq.	Dadu.
107.	Khan Saheb Meherjeebhai Kuverjee Tarapurwalla.	Kohlapur.
108.	Dr. Muncherjee Byramjee Colah, M.D.	Surat.
109.	Maharaj Koomar Rameshwar Singh, Esq.	Bhagulpore.
110.	M. B. Namjosi, Esq.	Poona.
111.	Naorojee P. Esq.	Bombay.
112.	Narayan Esq.	Bombay.
113.	Naorojee Furdoonjee, Esq.	Bombay.
114.	Nusserwanjee Byramjee, Esq.	Bombay.
115.	Nusserwanjee Ruttonjee Tata, Esq.	Bombay.
116.	Rao Saheb Narayen Bhai.	Bombay.
117.	Nusserwanjee Chandabhai, Esq.	Bombay.
118.	Nanu Narayen Kothare, Esq.	Bombay.
119.	Nanabhai Rustomjee Ranina, Esq.	Bombay.
120.	Nusserwanjee Coyajee, Esq.	Bombay.
121.	Nilkanth Vinayek Chhutre, Esq., L.C.E.	Poona.
122.	Narayen Gunesh Deshpande, Esq.	Amhednugger.
123.	A. Narsim Yangar, Esq.	Mysore.
124.	Ochavram Mitharam, Esq.	Surat.
125.	Khan Bahadoor Puddumjee Pestonjee.	Poona.
126.	Pestonjee Sorabjee Khureghat, Esq.	Bombay.
127.	Pestonjee Kavasjee, Esq.	Bombay.
128.	Purshotum Odhanjee, Esq.	Bombay.
129.	Pestonjee Hormusjee Patuk, Esq.	Ahmednugger.
130.	Rao Bahadoor Poorunmul Khoobchund.	Shikarpur.
131.	Surgeon P. J. Damania, I.M.D.	Neemuch.
132.	Rahimtoola Mahomed Sayani, Esq.	Bombay.
133.	Rustomjee Jamsetjee Ashburner, Esq.	Bombay.
134.	Rustomjee Dossabhai Sethna, Esq.	Bombay.
135.	Rustomjee Eduljee, Esq.	Bombay.
136.	Sukaram Narayen, Esq.	Bombay.
137.	Shapoorjee Jeevajee, Esq.	Bombay.
138.	Soonderrao Raghoonath, Esq.	Bombay.
139.	Soraljee Nusserwanjee Wadia, Esq.	Bombay.
140.	Sorabjee Naorojee Wadia, Esq.	Bombay.
141.	Dr. Sukaram Arjoon.	Bombay.
142.	Sorabjee Cowasjee Khumbhatta, Esq.	Bombay.
143.	Rao Saheb Sitaram Vishwanath Putverdhan.	Poona.
144.	Shrivandas Chandoomul, Esq.	Scinde.
145.	Shrikristna Nurhur, Esq.	Umravati.
146.	Shrivulubh Bhugwanjee, Esq.	Rajkote.
147.	Tookaram Tatia, Esq.	Bombay.
148.	Dr. Temooljee Bhikhajee Nariman.	Bombay.
149.	Thakoredas Atmaram.	Bombay.
150.	Vinayekrao Wassodeojee, Esq.	Bombay.
151.	Virchund Deepchund, Esq.	Bombay.
152.	Vithal Narayen Phatuk, Esq.	Sattara.
153.	Rao Saheb Wassodeo Juggonnath Kirtiker	Bombay.

THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION.

16, MARINE STREET, FORT.

TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE MOST HONOURABLE THE
MARQUIS OF RIPON, K.G., P.C., G.C.B., THE VICEROY
AND GOVERNOR-GENERAL OF INDIA IN COUNCIL,
CALCUTTA.

YOUR EXCELLENCY,—I have the honour to forward the following Resolution of the Managing Committee of the Bombay Branch of the East India Association, passed at their meeting held on the 6th of November, 1882, thanking your Excellency in Council for vetoing the Act passed by the Government of Bombay, intituled Bill No. 3, of 1882, to amend Bombay Act II. of 1873.

I have the honour to be,

Your Excellency's most obedient servant,

(Signed) DAJI ABAJI KHARE, *Honorary Joint Secretary.*

BOMBAY, November 7th, 1882.

Resolution of Thanks to His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor-General of India in Council from the Managing Committee of the Bombay Branch of the East India Association, regarding the vetoing the Act passed by the Government of Bombay, intituled Bill No. 3, of 1882, to amend Bombay Act II., of 1882.

RESOLVED :

That the best and most cordial thanks of the Managing Committee of the Bombay Branch of the East India Association be tendered to His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor-General of India in Council for vetoing the Act passed by the Government of Bombay, intituled Bill No. 3, of 1882, to amend Bombay Act II., of 1873.

The Committee do not think it necessary to trouble his Lordship the Viceroy with any lengthy remarks, as the reasons assigned for the veto speak conclusively as to the necessity which his Excellency in Council felt for it. The point the Committee have and desire to note is that in all matters of legislation the real opinion of the people needs to be ascertained from independent sources of the people themselves, and not as represented by the officials. And the Committee therefore take this opportunity of thanking again for one of the resolutions of the past two years as directly bearing upon legislation—namely, the due, wide, and sufficiently long publicity of the proposals of Government for any legislation, so as to elicit fully the opinion of the press and of the people.

In the case of the Act now vetoed, the consensus of opinion of the unofficial members of the Council, the press, and the people, was so marked and emphatic, that the Committee regret that the Bombay Government did not give it such consideration and weight as it deserved. If such emphatic and clear opinion of the public and of the press can be thus disregarded as in the present instance, there will be no such thing as the people's voice, which in all well-regulated communities forms an important factor in the matter of legislation.

The Committee conclude with repeating their hearty thanks for the present veto, but for which much hardship to the people and trouble to the Government, besides interference with trade, would have resulted by the enforcement of the Act.

BOMBAY, *November 7th*, 1882.

THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION.

16, MARINE STREET, FORT.

TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE MOST HONOURABLE THE
MARQUIS OF RIPON, K.G., P.C., G.C.B., THE VICEROY
AND GOVERNOR-GENERAL OF INDIA IN COUNCIL,
CALCUTTA.

YOUR EXCELLENCY,—I have the honour to forward the following Resolution of the Managing Committee of the Bombay Branch of the East India Association, passed at their meeting held on the 30th of October, 1882, thanking your Excellency in Council for the various important Resolutions issued during the last two years.

I have the honour to be,

Your Excellency's most obedient servant,

(Signed) DAJI ABAJI KHARE, *Honorary Joint Secretary*.

BOMBAY, *October 31st*, 1882.

Resolution of Thanks to His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor-General of India in Council, from the Managing Committee of the Bombay Branch of the East India Association, regarding the several Resolutions of the Government of India during the last two years.

RESOLVED :

That the Managing Committee of the Bombay Branch of the East India Association desire to express their most cordial and grateful thanks to his Excellency the Viceroy and Governor-General in Council for the resolutions on the subject of the encouragement of local arts

and industries, local self-government, and suspensions and remissions of land revenue and others.

While waiting to express their hearty thanks for the several important resolutions issued by your Lordship in Council, the Committee had hoped that they may have the opportunity of expressing their satisfaction both at your Lordship's resolution, as well as at their practical results, by the adoption of a liberal and hearty co-operation by the Government of Bombay. The Committee need not say how greatly disappointed and grieved they felt at the narrow and not well-considered Resolution of the Government of Bombay of the 19th of September last. And the Committee feel it the more keenly on this account, their gratitude and obligations at the statesmanlike and liberal reply of your Lordship's Government of the 4th of October. The Committee beg leave to express a sincere hope that the Government of Bombay will legally and heartily enter into the spirit and the benign objects of your Lordship's resolutions, and ungrudgingly make every effort to give full and successful effort to them.

Your Lordship has very properly taken an exception to the Bombay Government, so completely avoiding to take and ignoring all Native and non-official opinion. It is simply impossible that our rulers can ever be able to do any good to the people without consulting the people themselves as to their real wants and the means of supplying them.

Your Excellency in Council has enunciated a most important principle in the resolution of the 4th October—a principle, which it has been always most difficult for the Natives to make Government understand and adopt. The resolution says : “ . . . The Governor-General in Council cannot but feel much doubt as to the power of any government to create public spirit otherwise than by offering to the public a practical opportunity for displaying and cultivating such a spirit in the management of some portion, however limited, of public affairs. It is far easier for an executive Government by its direct action to check and hamper the development of public spirit than to create it.” Truer words were never spoken.

The Committee sincerely trust that this most important principle of the absolute necessity of “ *a practical opportunity for displaying and cultivating public spirit,*” or any other quality, will be ever hereafter borne in mind by our rulers, instead of always unreasonably demanding from us to be prepared to swim before going into water.

The Committee also avail themselves of this early opportunity of expressing their satisfaction at the resolution of 14th of October, on the subject of relief by suspensions and remissions of revenue in time of

scarcity. This step, the Committee believes, is in the right direction, and is likely to mitigate the horrors and miseries of and after a scarcity or famine. The Committee also make bold to suggest that if the operation of this resolution should be extended to the Bombay Presidency, the chief object of the Deccan Agriculturists Relief Act would considerably be satisfied. The Committee sincerely trust that this resolution will be carried into effect in a sympathetic and liberal spirit by the local government.

In conclusion, the Committee once more repeat their heartfelt thanks for all the great and good steps taken by your Excellency's Government during the past two years as a beginning of the material, moral, and political advancement of the Natives of India.

(Signed) DAJI ABAJI KHARE, *Honorary Joint Secretary.*

BOMBAY, *October 31st, 1882.*

Address to the Education Commission of 1882 by the Managing Committee of the Bombay Branch of the East India Association.

WE, the Managing Committee of the Bombay Branch of the East India Association, heartily welcome, Sir, your commission to this great city. Your commission is of very high importance for the future advancement of India in its material, moral, and political conditions. The education of the people of this vast country is one of the most effective means of raising it in civilization.

We take this opportunity of expressing some of our views on this most weighty subject. The first, and the most important, question is the means to supply all degrees of education to the vast population of India. As it is at present the means are extremely inadequate, and only a fifteenth or a still smaller portion of the school-age population yet receive education at all. Some more than 20,000,000 of the rising generation receive no education at all, except what some indigenous schools provide to some portion.

Government feel that they are not able to tax the people directly in some way or the other, and the effort which Government now make is to find out some means by which the people may be induced to tax themselves for the purpose of education. That it is very desirable to make the people take their education in their own hands we freely and fully admit, and it is in fact one of the most effectual means of bringing home to them or educating them in local self-government, an object so nobly undertaken by the present Viceroy with sincerity and energy. But the great question is where to find the means in the

present extreme poverty of the country. We do not desire to make this address a lengthy one. The various details of the best methods of giving the most useful education would be far more ably placed before you than those who have directed their best attention to the practical working of the department. We confine ourselves here to some of the broad questions concerned in it.

The question of education is but a small portion of the various national wants of this country, and it is absolutely necessary that the causes of its present poverty should be removed before any of its wants, whether of education or others, can be adequately supplied. For this purpose the most important remedy, we submit, is to make the whole administration less costly by a larger infusion of Native agency. Then only will the people enjoy what they produce—will be able to supply all their wants; and, under the guidance of high English supervision, will advance in prosperity and civilization. We once more submit therefore that a large reduction of European agency is absolutely necessary as the great remedy for the present material and moral poverty of India. With a returning prosperity the Government will be well able to obtain the necessary means to provide to the fullest extent (all high or low) the educational as well as all other important wants of the country.

We here wish to touch upon two points only applicable to the question of education directly. We beg to urge that it is high time, after the educational efforts of more than half a century, that all educational posts should be filled up by Natives, excepting only the highest in each province, to keep up a living connection with the current of European progress in thought. We have heard with satisfaction that Government do not intend to recede in the least from the present extent of highest education, and one cannot but feel that a still much larger extension of it is necessary. As one important result, out of others, of high education, we think it necessary to mention here that it has had a great influence in raising the moral and general character of the educated.

The importance of primary education for the masses cannot be denied by anyone, and when Government themselves are alive to this necessity and have considered it important enough to justify the present commission, we do not think it right to waste any words upon this subject. We would simply make a short reference to the question of female education.


When boys' schools were opened it was difficult enough to get pupils, and for many years education was free. In the case of female education the inducements to parents to educate their daughters are


far less, till the time comes when the people generally will understand the necessity and importance of female education for the best sake of the males themselves—that good and educated mothers only can bring up good, educated, true and manly sons, not to say anything of the rights of humanity; that women are as much entitled to the rights and privileges of this world as men, though each have their peculiar work in their respective spheres. It is greatly necessary in the present state of the lights of the people on this great question that Government should give every possible and liberal aid for a long time to come. That Government may require efficiency in the schools is quite right; but the education should be as much free as possible to draw the largest members of pupils to the schools, even more so, than what was done for the boys. With reference to the system of Grant-in-aid we regard it as one of the best means of attaining the object in view, but we submit, with every deference, that as a matter of justice, righteousness, and policy, the fundamental principle of the “Conscience Clause” must be made a necessary condition, as in the United Kingdom, or we apprehend that great difficulties and even disasters will arise from the non-enforcement of this principle, as India is a place of all the religions in the world. And, unless a thorough freedom of conscience and neutrality in religious matters is most strictly observed, the convulsions arising from religious wars will, we submit, be such as we can hardly form at present any adequate conception of. Mooltan and Solam riots give some indication of what disastrous results may ensue where whole classes of different religions set up against each other.

We include this Address with our best wishes for the success of this commission, and we sincerely trust that it will lead Government to consider the great Indian problem in all its magnitude and importance.

(Signed) DAJI ABAJI KHARE, *Honorary Joint Secretary.*

BOMBAY, October 31st, 1882.





"A book that is shut is but a block"

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

GOVT. OF INDIA
Department of Archaeology
NEW DELHI

Please help us to keep the book
clean and moving.

B. 2., 145, N. DELHI.